DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 056 24 HE 001 923

AUTHOR	Silverman, Robert J.
TITLE	A Study of the Inter-Organizational Behavior in Consortia. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y. Cooperative Extension Service.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-9-B-012
PUB DATE	Nov 69
GRANT	OEG-2-9-420012-1018(010)
NOTE	309p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$1.25 HC-$15.55
DESCRIPTORS	Behavior Patterns, *Consortia, *Cooperative Programs, Coordination, *Higher Education, *Interaction Process Analysis, *Interinstitutional Cooperation, Relationship

ABSTRACT

In an attempt to formulate hypotheses and administrative guidelines for voluntary consortia in higher education, a heuristic framework was devised through which behavioral patterns of consortia member organizations and their representatives could be ascertained. The rationale, the framework, and the methodology of the study are first discussed. The bulk of the report is devoted to descriptions and analyses of two consortia arrangements: (1) the Association, a group of 9 institutions of higher learning in the Northeast; and (2) the Masters University-Lewis State College project, a cooperative relationship between a Northern University and a Negro college in the South. Three other cooperative arrangements are also briefly discussed: (1) a joint graduate degree program between 2 catholic colleges: (2) the University Center, a cooperative agreement among 5 institutions to provide extension education; and (3) the Institute for Urban Educational Problems, a non-profit independent agency formed by 6 institutions of higher education in a large urban area. On the basis of this study 9 major hypotheses were formulated which have major significance for the functioning of interorganizational relationships in higher education. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Final Report
Project No. 9-B-012
Grant No. OEG-2-9-420012-1018 (010)

A STUDY OF THE INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOR IN CONSORTIA

Robert J. Silverman, Assistant Investigator
Joan Roos Egner, Principal Investigator
Department of Education
New York State College of Agriculture
A Statutory College of the State University
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York 14850
November 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

HE001923

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

The author was born on January 14, 1940 in Paterson, New Jersey and in 1957 graduated from Butler High School, Butler, New Jersey.

He majored in English at Rutgers University and after receiving his A.B. in 1961 entered the United States Army as a Second Lieutenant. While on active duty, he was "extended" for the Berlin Crisis. Upon separation from the service, he entered Teachers College, Columbia University and in June 1963 received an M.A. in student personnel administration in higher education.

In September 1963, the author assumed the position of program advisor at Willard Straight Hall, the college union at Cornell University, and in the following year was appointed program director and was named to the Professional Development Committee of the Association of College Unions.

He entered a doctoral program at Cornell University in September 1966 with a major in educational administration and minors in sociology and the history, sociology, and philosophy of education. The author was supported by a National Defense Education Act Title IV Fellowship, was appointed to the national honorary Phi Kappa Phi, and received a U.S. Office of Education Grant for his dissertation.

With an interest in the sociology of organizations, educational administration, and student personnel work, the author assumed the position of Assistant Professor at The Ohio State University beginning October 1969.

The author is married and has two children.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is indebted to a number of individuals for their support and active assistance that culminated in this dissertation.

Professor Joan Roos Egner, chairman of the author's special committee, has for the past three years given freely of her time and advice and in so many ways has been instrumental in the author's development and achievements. Professor Isabel Peard, a humanitarian, admired by all but emulated by few, has helped the author understand the meaning of education; and Professor William Foote Whyte has been of inestimable value in his continued critical support of the methodology and substance of this dissertation.

There are, of course, many others to whom the author is indebted. Among them, Professor Gerald Gordon helped the author gain a critical understanding of organizational theory, and Professor Mark Beach provided the opportunity to learn how "exciting" research could be. The U.S. Office of Education supported the present study [OEG-2-9-420012-1018 (010)] which could not have been conducted in its present form without their generosity.

Finally, I want to thank my wife, Maxine, for creating the type of home life conducive to study and creative work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I RATIONALE. 1

II THE FRAMEWORK. 11

III METHODOLOGY. 32

- Selection of Cases 33
- The Field Work 34
- Writing and Analyzing. 39

IV THE ASSOCIATION. 40

- History and Background 40
- Purpose and Activities 42
- Member Institutions--Statistics. 45
- The Environment. 49
  - The Physical Environment. 49
  - The Political-Social Environment. 53
  - The Professional Environment. 61
- The Organization 62
  - The Central Staff 62
  - The Board of Trustees 75
  - The Individual Colleges 88
- Programming. 101
  - Planning. 101
  - Role Behavior 111
  - Committees and Meetings 122
- Functions. 131
  - Rewards 131
  - Problem-Solving 141
- Conclusion 142

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter Page

V THE MASTERS UNIVERSITY--LEWIS STATE COLLEGE PROJECT . . . 144

History and Background 144
Purposes 146

Institutional 146
Title III Funding 149

Brief Outline of the Colleges. 152
The Environment 153
The Organization 156

Coordinators. 156
Institutional Presidents. 161
Individual Colleges 162

Programming. 176

Planning. 176
Role Behavior 181
Committees. 183
Meetings. 185

Functions. 188

Rewards 188
Problem-Solving 195

VI THREE CASE STUDIES 199

Introduction 199
Section One--The St. Thomas University-Sacred College Cooperative 199

Environment, Background, Personnel. 200
The Program 201
Functions 203
Psychological Cooperation 206

Section Two--The University Center 207

Background, Purposes. 208
Governance. 209
Program 211

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter Page

Prestige and Image 212
New Purpose. 213
Functions. 216

Section Three--The Institute for Urban Educational Problems 218

Toward a Consortium 218
Personnel. 221
Away from the Consortium 221
Functions. 224

VII FIELD WORK IN AN INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT 228

Entrance 228
Interaction. 230
The Interviewer's Effect on the System 234

VIII IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY 237

The Environment 241
Goals 246
Central Staff/Governance 251
The Member Organizations 253
The Organizational Representatives. 262
Benefits (Rewards and Problem-Solving 267
Summary 272

APPENDICES 274

BIBLIOGRAPHY 282

SUMMARY

Purpose of Study

In an attempt to formulate hypotheses and administrative guidelines for voluntary consortia in higher education, the author devised a heuristic framework through which behavioral patterns of consortia member organizations and their representatives could be ascertained.

The study is based on the assumptions that individuals' perceptions of the significance of present or potential benefits accruing from involvement and a latent role orientation, internal versus external loyalties, will provide hypotheses about interaction patterns in a consortium context. Furthermore, the nature of the relationships will be influenced by the following mediating variables: the "external system," such as the characteristics of the educational organizations; "felt needs," as those related to the representatives' positions in the colleges; and "observed needs" from peer groups.

The framework is based on bargaining and exchange theory.

Design

The author engaged in non-participant observation in this exploratory study of voluntary consortia. Two arrangements were studied for a total of five months and three others were observed for a total of three weeks. The case studies were based on a variety of consortia types: a college center, bilaterals between a Negro college and major university, and between two colleges in the area of graduate education, a multilateral

in the area of extension education, and an organization which began with a consortium emphasis but developed into an industrial model.

Findings

A large number of hypotheses were formulated on the basis of the exploratory field experience. Some seem, to the author, to be more "powerful" than others. Accordingly, nine hypotheses are listed below which, it is suggested, have major significance for the functioning of inter-organizational relationships in higher education.

1. The more threatening the environment, the greater the impetus for the threatened organizations to join in a consortium.

2. The nature of consortium involvement is dependent upon the nature and significance of the benefits from such involvement.

3. Colleges interacting in strength areas will increase the probabilities of reciporcation and mutual respect within the consortium context.

4. Interaction patterns are strongly related to the prestige ratings of the member organizations and representatives in a consortium.

5. The thrust of the director (idealist, high task activity) is related to the growth of a consortium.

6. Representatives on the boundaries of their respective organizations are more likely than non-boundary personnel to have "meaningful interaction" in a consortium.

7. The reward function will be less conflict-laden when the organizational representatives have heterogeneous or complementary operational goals, perspectives, expectations, or needs.

8. Problem-solving among organizational representatives is related to the homogeneity of their goals, needs, purposes, or perspectives.

9. Problem-solving activity is more likely among representatives of highly paradigmatic disciplines.

CHAPTER I

RATIONALE

Inter-organizational arrangements in higher education, which take the form of state boards, regional compacts, and voluntary consortia, have increased both in numbers and in scope over the past two decades and all indications point to a further expansion in the years ahead. In this dissertation, the investigator examines voluntary consortia within a framework whose heuristic properties are oriented towards the understanding of organizational processes in an inter-institutional setting: cooperation, conflict, decision-making, leadership, communication, innovation.

This is an exploratory study. Although there is a plethora of articles on the topic of inter-institutional cooperation in higher education, few attempt to give rounded pictures of consortia or make the effort to understand the organizational dynamics on a theoretical level. Most are "public relations" efforts. Thus, this dissertation has a two-fold purpose: first, for the administrator, whether in government or higher education, to be sensitized to the limitations and potentialities of consortia due to organizational variables and to have a guide for analyzing, evaluating, and developing inter-collegiate relationships. Secondly, to contribute to a yet small but slowly growing literature in the field of inter-organizational behavior.

Before treating the theoretical framework in some depth, the investigator will examine some aspects of inter-institutional arrangements: why they evolved and descriptions of the different types, with emphasis on voluntary consortia. Ways in which consortia have been conceived, their characteristics, strengths, weaknesses, and administration, will be discussed briefly.

Institutions of higher education, though similar in many respects to other types of organizations, do have unique problems. According to J. J. Corson, their goals lack clarity, the products and services are intangible and are difficult to evaluate, the customers exercise limited influence on the decision-makers, many faculty lack commitment to the organization and have multiple roles, and internal communication is difficult.

Policy-making also suffers. The trustees, says Corson, have failed to formulate educational policy, the president is ejected from central concerns because of demands on his time, and the faculty are either not consulted on important matters or exercise their vote to preserve the status quo.[1] "The academic issues that require a total institutional perspective for their isolation and resolution tend to be held in a perpetual state of abeyance."[2] When there is innovation, it usually results from outside pressures: from governments, foundations, and generous alumni, rather than from the organization's initiative.

Colleges and universities also exist in the larger social system

---

1. J. J. Corson, "The University - A Contrast in Administrative Process," Public Administration Review, 20:2-9.

2. Neal Gross, "Organizational Lag in American Universities," Harvard Educational Review, 33:58-73.

and are subject to environmental influences and conditions as are all organizations. Higher educational institutions are being asked to perform more and more central tasks for our society, to be more sophisticated in what they do, for increased numbers of students, and without a commensurate increase in financing or personnel.

There is, then, an increasing pressure from society and an inability or a failure of higher educational institutions to function optimally with their traditional methods and through the present patterns of organization. As a result, state and institutional administrators, foundations, and educators are calling for and instituting a "greater rationalization in the total pattern of American higher education...in opposition to independence, autonomy, and lack of system" that until recently has existed.[3]

There are three main patterns being followed, each, of course having many variations. First, state governments have instituted governing, coordinating and governing-coordinating "superboards" to establish policy with respect to public higher educational facilities. The boards usually conceive a master plan and, according to their functions, become more or less deeply involved with the actual administration of the colleges and universities under their jurisdictions.

Second, groups of states have banded together into regional compacts to encourage cooperative relations among the institutions in the region, to strengthen the bonds between state legislators and educational representatives, and to meet the long-term educational needs of the geographical areas represented. At present, three such organizations exist: in New England, the South, and the West.

---

[3] T. R. McConnell, A General Pattern for American Public Higher Education, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962, pp. 2-3.

The third general pattern of inter-institutional arrangements consists of voluntary cooperative programs known as consortia. As Ertell has indicated, they "embrace the variety of arrangements, contracts, understandings, agreements and other relationships which exist between two or more institutions...in such a way that the participants retain their identities and individualities."[4]

There are more than one thousand formal voluntary arrangements operational, and many go unrecorded. These arrangements have been classified by Raymond Moore according to their purpose (e.g. share facilities, pool resources); structure (fraternal bilateral, federation of bilaterals); kind or function (academic, administrative); interchange (faculty, student); initiative (legislative pressure, voluntary); agreement (charter, contract); and control (public, private).[5] In spite of the great diversity, however, there are some major characteristics that apply to most: voluntary leadership, diversified membership, control in the hands of a council or executive committee, financial support by members with foundation aid, coordination of activities by an executive director, and a constant search for information through surveys and discussions or proposals.[6]

---

4. Merton W. Ertell, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education: A Study of Experiences with Reference to New York State, University of the State of New York, Albany, 1957, p. 3.

5. Raymond Moore, "Cooperation in Higher Education," in L. C. Howard, ed. Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Institute on Human Relations, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1967, pp. 304-324.

6. George F. Donovan, "The Philosophy of Interinstitutional Cooperation in American Higher Learning," in G. F. Donovan, ed. College and

In order to gain a sensitivity toward the arrangements, however, it is instructive to read from the articles of association or charters of the cooperatives. The West Virginia Association of College and University Presidents strives to encourage both a total public awareness of the importance of higher education and a greater proportion of high school graduates to seek a college education, to experiment with new methods of teaching for cost effectiveness, and to seek broader financial support from the public and private sectors.[7]

The Association of State Institutions in Colorado conducts cost studies and budget analyses; and it encourages joint use of institutional resources, such as unusual research equipment, libraries, and faculty.[8] And the Kansas City Regional Council provides for communication and planning among educational institutions and other community agencies.[9] The Council, in a newsletter, encourages faculty and staff to submit ideas for new projects reflecting these criteria: the goal can best be achieved by a combination of institutions rather than by one, must try to achieve substantial improvement in the instructional program or administrative operation, with the provision that not all Council members need

---

University Interinstitutional Cooperation, Catholic University of America Press, Washington, 1964, pp. 4-6.

7. For the Future Well Being... West Virginia Association of College and University Presidents. (No further information.)

8. M. M. Chambers, Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1961, pp. 80-81.

9. Purposes-Programs. Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, 1964.

be served (or accept) a specific project.[10]

Among the twenty-four "rules of thumb" of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, a consortium of ten small colleges, are the following: "the programs should be representative of the basic and best purposes and principles of the academic programs of our member colleges,...they should not be in competition with programs already part of the curricula of the colleges...should reach many students and faculty who will, after participating in them, act as stimulants upon their return to their own campuses,...and participation...should contribute to sabbatical and tenure privileges as if the faculty member were on his home campus.[11]

In general, the evaluations of the arrangements by members have been very positive,[12] possibly because of the limited, non-strategic nature of the enterprises and the public relations emphasis that the marginal programs receive; but nevertheless, the potential and actual strengths have outweighed the limitations in the perceptions of the evaluators. One can cite:

> More effective utilization of resources, both physical and personnel; program enrichment in the way of broadened offerings and a more stable selection; economy of operation by reducing faculty, plant, and fund needs to an operational level consistent with sound administration; enhanced community service through the selection of competence areas by cooperating institutions and through reduced duplication of offerings; institu-

---

[10] *Coordinator*, Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education, III, 8, Summer 1967.

[11] *Faculty Handbook September 1968*, The Associated Colleges of the Midwest, Chicago.

[12] R. E. Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 323.

> tional stimulation embracing students, faculty, administration, and staff.[13]

Consortia create greater realization of the commonality of problems facing higher education, give focus to issues and force commitment to responsibilities, speed up research,[14] and aid in the survival of the marginal college. In short, they help old forms adjust to new realities without compromising the integrity of the membership.[15]

There are, however, limitations to these new forms which have caused states to institute governing-coordinating boards as an antidote. The limits include the selection of peripheral problems; institutional self-interest; the difficulty of making organizational and representative machinery congruent with tasks and expectations; lack of financial strength for experimentation;[16] problems of institutional identity; competitiveness; differences due to multiple standards; joint faculty appointments raising questions of loyalties and availability for committee work, interference with scholarly activities, and promotions; scheduling problems and course pre-requisites; differences in admission requirements; shortage of administrative time; utilization of public funds when private schools are in the consortium; some men who would rather not see their work in light of comparison, and projects failing

---

13. S. V. Martorana, et. al., Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1961, p. 4.

14. P. L. Dressel and L. B. Mayhew, "Cooperation Among Colleges in Educational Planning and Research," The Educational Record, 34: 129.

15. Eldon Johnson, "Consortia in Higher Education," The Educational Record, 48:344.

16. Ibid., pp. 345-346.

when proposed or carried out by the wrong person.[17, 18]

As if these were not sufficient, college administrators become concerned when anticipating precedents established that might be hard to overcome later, or the sharing of public credit, or the confusion of the two organizations in the public mind.[19] The membership is usually not under any obligation to participate in any program and can threaten withdrawal; communication among the members is of the first importance and is difficult; and there is some fear the central secretariat will expand too much, taking on more and more functions and giving extra tasks to the membership.[20]

The importance of inter-institutional arrangements for the future viability of higher education is generally recognized. That strong administrative leadership, either by institutional members and/or an executive director, is important seems obvious in light of the potential benefits, the hazardous limitations that should be avoided, and the unique operational problems they present.

Faculty and administrators must be able to examine their own institutions closely, explore gaps, admit weaknesses, accept "rivals," develop mutual trust, cooperate in planning, and share resources.[21]

---

17. Ertell, op. cit., pp. 98-100.

18. S. F. Salwak, "The Need for Cooperation and the CIC Response," The Educational Record, 45:313.

19. Philip Selznick, TVA and the Grass Roots, Harper, New York, 1966, p. 166.

20. K. P. Bunnell and E. L. Johnson, "Interinstitutional Cooperation," in S. Baskin, ed. Higher Education: Some Newer Developments, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965, p. 254.

21. S. V. Martorana, op. cit., pp. 35-37.

Usually these practices and procedures are first entered into with respect to the marginal areas, the programs are limited and peripheral.[22] However, many times "a cooperative dynamic is developed in which one cooperative program suggests another, until the administrators and faculty members of the affiliated institutions find themselves to a surprising degree thinking cooperatively."[23]

Although Zaleznik and Moment suggest, on one level, that ambiguity in task and group procedures creates conditions for a heightened sense of psychological interdependence leading either to a high risk of failure or high potential returns,[24] Burton Clark outlines the practical difficulties "ambiguity" creates for the administration of inter-institutional arrangements: authority and supervision are by shared specific agreements to those who have responsibilities or problems, but rights to command do not necessarily go to those who are competent to use it; there is loose general accountability and supervision; standards of work are neither explicit nor formal but indirect and are maintained by manipulating resources and incentives; and an administrator cannot reassign personnel. Finally, decision-making occurs in increments over time.[25]

This has been an outline of the potential and actual strengths and problems facing consortia in higher education. The purpose of this

---

22. Ertell, op. cit.

23. H. W. K. Fitzroy, "The Richmond Area University Center: An Experiment in Cooperation," The Educational Record, 38:241.

24. Abraham Zaleznik and David Moment, The Dynamics of Inter-Personal Behavior, John Wiley, New York, 1964, p. 146.

25. Burton R. Clark, "Interorganizational Patterns in Education," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10:234-236.

dissertation is to investigate them more fully and to develop hypotheses in the context of organizational behavior.

CHAPTER II

THE FRAMEWORK

The investigator developed and utilized a heuristic framework,[1] based on role and game theory, to investigate the dynamics of interorganizational relationships. The framework and its assumptions served as the lens through which the cases were observed.

With the heuristic device, one can examine the roles that representatives from individual higher educational organizations take when they interact to decide on a course of action, to work on specific proposals, or to evaluate a program. It is assumed that the behavior patterns of organizational representatives will enable us to understand organizational relations.

The author believes that individuals cooperate for benefits, whether hard or symbolic, with a long or short range perspective, and that continued interaction is dependent on a favorable benefit-cost ratio. Further, college representatives can be oriented to their own and/or others' needs.

The framework and the interaction of variables are described in this chapter.

---

[1] The heuristic device is presented schematically in Appendix A.

The first independent variable is derived from Robert Merton's dictum that "each role-set needs to be examined in terms of the mechanisms making for differing degrees of involvement...among the diverse people making (it) up...."[2] Merton suggests, and the investigator follows, that the intensity of involvement can be classified as either _peripheral_ or _central_.[3] There are, of course, college relationships which exhibit a greater degree of interaction than others and interdependencies can be more or less pronounced in particular areas of one consortium. It is posited that the degree of involvement in the consortium is dependent upon the perceived significance of the benefits by the individual who is either contemplating becoming or who already is a consortium member.

There is little question that "the individual responds to his environment in terms of his perceptions of that environment."[4] In addition, the literature in group leadership strongly suggests that individuals will attempt acts of leadership when the solution of the group's task (mutual problem) will be rewarding.[5] Thus, it seems that perceptions of potential benefits, group attractiveness, which in some measure is the product of past benefits, or group effectiveness,[6] is a major predictor of an individual's involvement in a system. In fact, Oscar Grusky, in a study of career mobility and organizational commitment, finds support for his hypothesis that "all else equal the greater the rewards an individual has received or expects to receive from an organization, the greater will be his degree of commitment to the system."[7]

---

[2] Robert Merton, _Social Theory and Social Structure_, The Free Press, Glencoe, 1957, p. 372.

[3] _Ibid_., p. 371.

[4] Ellis L. Scott, _Leadership and Perceptions of Organization_, The Ohio State University, 1956, p. 9.

[5] John K. Hemphill, _et_. _al_., _Leadership Acts III_, The Ohio State Research Foundation, 1955, p. 38.

Benefits, of course, must be conceived broadly. Not only do they include savings in money, but it is a "balancing" among such factors as the intrinsic importance of the goals, the anticipated costs, the perceived probabilities of goal attainment, and the anticipated time span to payoff.[8] On the basis of these criteria, one can determine whether an individual perceives the benefits as central or peripheral to his or to the organization's purposes.

The second independent variable is the latent role orientation of the individual member of the consortium, specifically, whether the representative perceives his role as spokesman for his program or institution (internal) and/or as a medium through which all of the member institutions can benefit from joint action (external). The literature on consortia stresses the importance of an external orientation and the difficulties of attaining it. T. R. McConnell says:

---

[6] Bernard Bass, Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior, Harper, New York, 1960, p. 42.

[7] Oscar Grusky, "Career Mobility and Organizational Commitment," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10:490.

[8] William F. Whyte and L. K. Williams, Toward an Integrated Theory of Development: Economic and Non-economic Variables in Rural Development, New York State School of I&LR, Ithaca, New York, 1968, pp. 59-70.

> It will take all the statesmanship the academic community can muster to enable colleges and universities to serve the broader public interest while preserving the identity, the integrity, the initiative, and the morale of the individual institutions and, especially, the intellectual freedom of faculty and students.[9]

Not only is a larger view needed "to provide adequate interface for dealing with certain aspects of emerging change in our society,"[10] but it is extremely difficult to produce. The faculty of the University of Minnesota perceives that individuals "will be torn between an obligation to the...institution which they represent, and its desirable development, and what is perceived....to be developments which are in the best interest of the whole pattern of higher education in the state." Effectiveness, it says, will be determined by putting the interests of the whole ahead of the institution.[11]

Most programs that consortia sponsor aid in the development of both the individual institutions (internal) and the voluntary association or effort (external).

The object of a relationship may be the attainment of superordinate goals,[12] or there may be a shared "motivation to solve both common and distinctive problems, while respecting the maintenance of legitimate

---

9. T. R. McConnell, "Government and the University: A Comparative Analysis," in Ross, ed. Governments and the University, St. Martin's Press, 1966, p. 92.

10. Annual Report, 1966-67, Committee on Institutional Cooperation. Purdue, p. 7.

11. Higher Education Tomorrow - Challenges and Opportunities for the University of Minnesota, University of Minnesota, mimeo, p. 16.

12. Musafer Sherif, Group Conflict and Cooperation: Their Social Psychology, Routledge and Kegan, Paul Ltd. London, 1966, p. 88.

group boundaries."[13] Even when congruence does not exist, "the private orientations of members...may differ considerably and still allow them to profess the same public values."[14]

For this study, "internal" orientation is viewed as the desire either for programs which benefit one organization while having a limited, no, or negative value for the others; or not becoming involved in programs and thus demonstrating an internal orientation by privatism. An "external" overtone assumes a desire to go beyond oneself, to engage in projects whose benefits transcend one's private needs, whether it be other organizations in the consortium or for the welfare of other elements in society--students can be aided in obtaining an education; public monies can be saved; innovations might develop which would then set a pattern for other educational organizations not in the consortium to follow.

It might be noted that this independent variable can be analyzed on a number of levels. For instance, a faculty representative might be internally oriented to his own career, with an external orientation being his institution or discipline. Of course, these levels have implications for analyzing the dynamics on a specific campus: an administrator with an internal orientation (institution) might interact

---

13. Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, "The Intergroup Dynamics of Win-Lose Conflict and Problem-Solving Collaboration in Union-Management Relations," in M. Sherif, ed., Intergroup Relations and Leadership: Approaches and Research in Industrial, Ethnic, Cultural, and Political Areas, John Wiley, New York, 1962, pp. 108-109.

14. W. H. Goodenough, Cooperation in Change: An Anthropological Approach to Community Development, John Wiley, New York, 1963, pp. 98, 112.

with a faculty member with an external orientation (institution).

In essence, institutional representatives make a fundamental, although at times unconscious choice, either to be self-oriented and/or to be oriented to the needs of the group; that, in fact, if there are few projects or if programs serving the goals of some individual members to the exclusion of others are uppermost, the coordinated effort will be less developed than it potentially is able to become. It might be added that Dearborn and Simon supported their hypothesis that executives, although encouraged to look at problems from a company-wide rather than departmental viewpoint, "perceive(d) those aspects of the situation that relate(d) specifically to the goals and activities of (their) department(s)."[15] An external pose is not easily accomplished.

The independent variables interact to signify four types of behavior.

First, if an individual is internally oriented to his institution as an administrator or his career or personal advancement as a faculty member and believes that the consortium's purposes or potentiality are central in importance for the functioning of his organization or fulfillment of personal goals, he will be classified as a "representative." This individual has a limited or constricted view of the broader implications of his involvement. His motto might be to get as much out of the arrangement, while putting in as little as possible.

---

[15] Dewitt C. Dearborn and H. A. Simon, "Selective Perception: A Note on the Departmental Identifications of Executives," Sociometry, 21:140, 143.

It is suggested that this mode of behavior precludes long-range planning,[16] makes for a less than thorough search for information,[17] and increases the likelihood of choosing less than adequate solutions to problems.[18]

The second type personifies an individual who according to Whyte and Williams sees that "social conscience and economics have a joint payoff."[19] In the context of this study this person is called an "educator." Inasmuch as cooperation and compromise are keystones of the effective functioning of voluntary arrangements, this person is externally oriented. He is concerned primarily with the success and future development of the consortium over the long-run rather than with the short-run goals his institution can achieve. He is willing to compromise for the sake of the cooperative. In addition, he perceives the consortium as having major significance for higher education and society. As a faculty member he might see the benefits accruing to the discipline he represents.

If the organization member's perception of the benefits either are that they have or should have peripheral value to the institution or his goals, and if he has an internal orientation, he will be classified as a "manager." He looks within, but lacks commitment, possibly because of his fear that entangling alliances would not receive trustee support, or lack of enchantment with the program, or other reasons resulting from the mediating variables to be discussed later.

---

[16] Goodenough, op. cit., p. 27.

[17] James A. Robinson, "Decision Making in the House Rules Committee," Administrative Science Quarterly, 3:83.

[18] Jane S. Mouton and Robert R. Blake, "The Influence of Competitively Vested Interests on Judgments," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 6:152.

[19] W. F. Whyte and L. K. Williams, op. cit., p. 48.

The fourth type is externally oriented but perceives few payoffs either to society or to higher education. He is not as committed as is the "educator," and is involved primarily as the result of external pressures, whether they take the form of public opinion, legislative influence, or foundation monies. Moos and Rourke suggest that a consortium founded upon external constraints is a facade of coordination without disturbing vested educational interests--in short, "back-scratching."[20] This person is called the "statesman."

There are two major sets of mediating variables, the first being the constraints of the external system. Within this broad category are the characteristics of the specific higher educational organizations that compose the consortium. How strong are they in resources, in prestige; how large; what are their purposes; are they public or private; developing or developed? Thus, the president of a weak, small, private, Negro college will experience constraints different from those on the leader of a stronger, larger, public, Negro institution. Does the college join by presidential fiat or faculty vote, because of limited resources or because the school's position as a very prestigious small liberal arts college is in jeopardy? Does a consortium member have certain misgivings since he represents the only denominational school in the arrangement?

---

[20] Malcolm Moos and Francis Rourke, The Campus and the State, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1959, p. 209.

Bass suggests that mutual esteem is highly related to group attractiveness and effectiveness.[21] The implications of this are great when junior colleges and major universities join in one consortium.

Algo Henderson, a student of university dynamics, posits that as the "college might be defensive and sensitive, the tendency of the large university is to make of the contract a 'project' as though it were part of the extension services....and the junior institution may find its position psychologically unacceptable."[22]

This chapter will indicate only briefly the other elements in this category--national and local political, educational, and economic factors, the nature of public opinion, social norms, and the explicit purpose of the consortium, which will affect the operational goals.

The developmental level of the state-sponsored higher educational system and the attitude of state officials toward the expenditure of public funds in a private group have far-reaching implications with regard to the impetus for and the type of membership in consortia. Similarly, the demands and level of understanding of the general public, especially in relation to economy, as they or their representatives interpret them, will have a gradual effect on collaboration.

Norms and legal codes applicable to organizational behavior in this

---

21. Bass, op. cit., p. 296.

22. A. Henderson, "Implications for Administration Arising from the Growing Interdependence of Colleges and Universities," in L. C. Howard, ed., Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Institute of Human Relations, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1967, p. 249.

country are based on the assumption of corporate individuality and inviolability. Thus, consortia must not only attempt basic activities in a relatively untried organizational structure, but must do so in an environment which although hospitable, as evidenced by public opinion, is simply not prepared to deal with public benefit collusion.

Weather conditions, transportation facilities, and a sense of logical regionalism will have an effect on the interaction rates and patterns in an arrangement; and the open or closed nature of the official purpose of the grouping obviously plays a major role.

Many consortia have broad purposes which have a minor effect on the daily operations of the voluntary groups. However, some goals are so explicit that in themselves they define the operational relationship.

The second major set of mediating variables refers to felt and observed needs relating to the manifest roles that the individual representatives hold in any organization. "Felt needs" will be mentioned first.

These constraints can arise from the personality of the individual spokesman. For instance, it seems obvious that an authoritarian personality would not fare as well in establishing a cooperative relationship as might another type of individual. In fact, one might be able to classify a person in one of the four behavior patterns mainly on the basis of personality.

The second source of constraint is the organizational position of the institutional representative. The investigator accepts Simon's dictum that:

> By whatever means the individual was originally motivated to adopt the role in the first place, the goals and constraints appropriate to the role, become a part of the decision-making program, stored in his memory, that defines his role behavior.[23]

Certainly a professor of history would behave differently from the president if for no other reason than the latter's role behavior is a series of negotiated external functions. In addition, Thibaut and Kelley suggest that persons having high power think of benefits and those of low power think of costs.[24] This would influence bargaining style.

The third sources are previous experiences on committees, in other consortia, and in the subject consortium. It has been suggested that perceptions and attitudes of individuals are carried over from earlier role experiences.[25] If the representative has experienced "do-nothing" committees, or sees their function as halting rather than facilitating progress, or has experienced success while a participant of another collaborative effort, this will influence his behavior in the consortium. In addition, the researcher must consider the actual accomplishments and "halo" surrounding the intercollegiate arrangement. What are its realistic potentialities? Hemphill suggests that an "extinguishing" effect results when leadership acts fail to solve a mutual problem in a group--fewer acts follow.[26]

---

[23] Herbert A. Simon, "On the Concept of Organizational Goal," Administrative Science Quarterly, 9:13.

[24] J. W. Thibaut and H. H. Kelley, The Social Psychology of Groups, John Wiley, New York, 1959, p. 102.

[25] E. Jacobson, et. al., "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations," Journal of Social Issues, 7:25.

The fourth component of felt needs refers to the other organizations of which the individual is a member. Active membership in one's disciplinary association or community organizations may relate to consortium participation. Faculty who are active in their disciplinary association might be more likely to engage in experimental curricula projects; faculty who are active in liberal political and social organizations are prime candidates for involvement in bilateral arrangements between developing and host institutions.

It seems clear, if one examines these felt needs, that an individual can experience intrapersonal tensions if the demands of the position, personality characteristics, or previous experiences do not mesh harmoniously. For example, a professor might experience great inner tension if he as an influential member of a weak school, representing a prestigious discipline, had to represent that organization in a consortium designed to upgrade it.

The second major set of manifest role factors refers to observed needs. These include the expectations of an individual's peer group or colleagues and significant others: those close to him who have both influence and expectations.

"A role is a set of expectations or a set of evaluative standards applied to an incumbent of a particular position."[27] It is recognized, and has been substantiated, that members of organizations who are on the

---

26. Hemphill, et. al., op. cit., p. 38.

27. Neal Gross, et. al., Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role, John Wiley, New York, 1958, p. 67.

"boundaries" experience a great deal of role conflict; and organizational representatives are temporarily on their institutions' boundaries.[28] However, role conflict can take different forms and can be of different degrees of strength. For instance, a representative would experience "inter-sender" conflict when pressures from the significant others or members of the peer group were different, and would encounter "inter-role" conflict when membership in one organization (the college) held opposite demands from other organizations to which the member belonged (consortium.)[29]

An example of the former might occur when the president and departmental colleagues had different expectations, or gave opposite support for a member's involvement. Inasmuch as participation might necessitate somewhat of a "local" orientation on the part of the member, the individual's peer group who upheld a "cosmopolitan" latent role expectation might fail to reinforce or reward ego's behavior.

With regard to inter-role conflict, it is posited that the college's desire for quick results or tangible short-term benefits would conflict with the expectations of some consortium members that cooperation should be a slow, gradual process; or demands by the president might conflict with what the representative might actually be able to obtain.

As an example of the type of conflict that can be generated by a consortium program, a representative of the Coordinated Western Massachusetts Consortium relates this anecdote about the creation of a joint department of astronomy: "Indeed I might admit that our joint department of astronomy began one year when all of our astronomers with a single exception, died, retired, or resigned. That is not easy to arrange."[30]

---

[28] For example see R. L. Kahn, et. al., Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity, John Wiley, New York, 1964.

[29] Ibid., p. 20.

Implicit in the above discussion is that there are strong opinions on different sides of issues that are communicated to ego who must negotiate their resolution, insulate himself, or live with stress. That this type of conflict occurs in many positions, and especially on the boundaries, can be assumed. However, inter and intrapersonal conflict also occurs because of a lack of communication--either the representative does not know what is expected of him, he is not supported when he returned to campus, or a person's position as "representative" is not parallel with the standing he has at his college.[31]

The Executive Director of the Piedmont University Center of North Carolina, in his first report, mentions but two problems. First, there is a lack of communication between institutional representatives who serve on the center committee and their colleagues at home.[32] Robinson's finding is interesting in this regard: "the less the flow of information from system sources, the more reliance will be placed on information within the decisional unit."[33] Second, the Director found that members involved in projects cannot speak with authority for their institutions.[34] An assistant dean of students for extracurricular activities is delegated to represent his institution to discuss block booking of talent but is not granted the power to make decisions, as other representatives are prepared to do; or he might make a commitment which is not supported by the dean.

---

[30] Stuart M. Stoke, "Cooperation at the Undergraduate Level," in G. Donovan, ed., College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation, Catholic University of America Press, Washington, 1965, p. 105.

[31] See Valentine F. Ridgeway, "Administration of Manufacturer-Dealer Systems," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1:480.

[32] First Report of the Executive Director, Piedmont University Center of North Carolina, May 1964.

[33] Robinson, op. cit., p. 82.

Stogdill suggests that "progress in intergroup transactions may depend upon an exact knowledge of the authority of the participants to commit the groups they represent" and that "commitment and follow-through are likely to be most firmly established when the participants ...are specifically authorized representatives of the group and its leadership in consensus."[35] Blake and Mouton feel that "one of the greatest barriers to intergroup cooperation through representative interaction stems from the traitor threat which involves loss of status and rejection of 'disloyal' persons who go against their group position even though there is an objective, logical, and factually based rationale for their doing so."[36]

This section will close by noting that the differing expectations held by others can have different intensities. Alters might have a specific view of ego's role performance only because they are unfamiliar with the charge under which he is acting and would readily modify their positions if they did know.[37]

---

[34] Piedmont University Report, op. cit., p. 6.

[35] Ralph M. Stogdill, "Intragroup - Intergroup Theory and Research," in M. Sherif, ed., Intergroup Relations and Leadership: Approaches and Research in Industrial, Ethnic, Cultural and Political Areas, John Wiley, New York, 1962, pp. 62-63.

[36] Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, "The Intergroup Dynamics of Win-Lose Conflict and Problem-Solving Collaboration in Union-Management Relations," in Sherif, ed., Ibid., p. 117.

To this point the investigator has dealt with individual roles, and like Parsons, has been concerned with the loyalties of particular persons --"the level of loyalty to a particular organization and the way in which this loyalty fits into the larger system of loyalties due to the plurality of roles."[38] Attention will now be turned to inter-organizational relationships and a discussion of "bargaining" which will be useful when analyzing the cases presented in the following chapters.

When dealing with inter-organizational theory, students look not at behavior resulting from structured authority, but as Litwak and Hylton point out, at behavior under conditions of partial conflict and stress factors which derive equally from all units of interaction.[39] Thibaut and Kelley dwell upon the different degrees of correspondence individuals, and one could posit organizations, achieve with each other, and the coalitions that result when the outcomes of a subset of group members correspond, but do not correspond to others in the group.[40]

---

[37] See Ernest G. Palola, "Organization Types and Role Strain: An Experimental Study of Complex Organizations," Sociology and Social Research, 51:171-184.

[38] Talcott Parsons, "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations - I," Administrative Science Quarterly, 1:81.

[39] Eugene Litwak and L. F. Hylton, "Inter-Organizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Coordinating Agencies," Administrative Science Quarterly, 6:399.

[40] John W. Thibaut and H. H. Kelley, op. cit., p. 167.

The relations that organizations have with each other, and this includes consortia members, can and have been conceived a number of ways; within any category, one could find examples from inter-collegiate groups: one college could attempt to co-opt another, reducing uncertainty by absorbing threats to its existence; two or more institutions might effect a coalition or joint venture in which they act as one with respect to certain goals; colleges might contract or negotiate an agreement for future performance.[41] If there is any factor which broadly conceived seems to override these distinctions, one assumption which is common to all and which appears to be a viable framework for perceiving the different relationships, it is "bargaining."

The concept of "bargaining" is not new in organizational theory. March and Simon imply this paradigm when discussing the inducement-contribution theory and E. W. Bakke conceives of the "fusion process" as one mass bargaining situation. However, both game and labor negotiation theory allow the student to extend this concept to inter-organizational behavior.

Bargaining implies a pre-disposition to become involved, it implies that the potential or actual values are central rather than peripheral to the actor. If there is limited interest, then "managers" and "statesmen" will be merely going through weak examples of bargaining, unless other members of the consortium see the group as central to their concerns.

---

[41] James D. Thompson and William McEwen, "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal Setting as an Interaction Process," American Sociological Review, 23:27-28; James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action: Social Science Bases of Administrative Theory, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967, pp. 35-36.

Their dealings will "be confined to contexts that do not interfere with the conduct of affairs within their respective groups."[42]

One can conceive of groups composed of "representatives" playing limited war with each other:

> Each party's strategy is guided mainly by what he expects the other to accept or insist on; yet each knows that the other is guided by reciprocal thoughts. The final outcome must be a point from which neither expects the other to retreat.[43]

A person's use of power will be to maximize his own position while destroying the stances of others.

However, given a very hostile environment, with immediate pressing needs by the institutions in a network, a "pure-collaboration" situation can be envisaged: the identical ranking of preferences.[44]

In fact, most groups will be composed of mixtures of the different role patterns. To best understand the variety of behaviors resulting from the many individuals involved and the different projects initiated, the investigator turns to an excellent work by Richard E. Walton and Robert B. McKersie, A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations: An Analyses of a Social Interaction System.

These authors posit three models: distributive bargaining dealing with fixed sums, integrated bargaining dealing with problems, and a combination of the two--all of which are useful in analyzing consortia. The researcher will quote and paraphrase paragraphs from this work in which these models are defined, for the definitions will be immensely useful in understanding the inter-organizational arrangements.

---

[42] Goodenough, op. cit., p. 102.

[43] Thomas C. Shelling, "Bargaining, Communication, and Limited War," The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1:29.

[44] Thomas C. Schelling, The Strategy of Conflict, Harvard, Cambridge, 1960, pp. 84-85.

Distributive Bargaining - Fixed Sum Games

> The fixed-sum, variable-share payoff situation...(is one) in which there is some fixed value available to the parties but in which they may influence shares which go to each. As such there is fundamental and complete conflict of interests.[45] Although there is cooperation to avoid mutual disaster, there is competition for the limited sums.
>
> In many instances the parties share a dependency because the relationship...is an exclusive one--neither party has another relationship which can perform the same function for the party, or alternate relationships are available only at a substantial cost.[46]

Integrative Bargaining - Problem Solving

> This model is based on problem solving: identifying the problem, searching for alternatives...(etc.) The facilitating conditions are motivation, regarding the problem as significant enough, unbiased fact finding, and trust. It thrives best in low sacrifice and high benefit situations.[47]
>
> "The parties start with a zero-sum situation, but through their efforts they create a positive sum." Since trust or incentive does not always exist among potential members, the committed member must create incentives which may, in fact, result in coersion--the expected loss of not participating being greater than the possible gains.[48]

---

45. R. E. Walton and R. B. McKersie, A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations: An Analysis of a Social Interaction System, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965, p. 13.

46. Ibid., p. 399.

47. Ibid., pp. 127-146.

48. Ibid., pp. 399-400.

Mixed Bargaining

> "In the mixed situation each side has a broad choice between (1) attempting to discover outcomes with larger total values and (2) working toward an outcome which has a smaller total value but which does provide him a relatively high individual payoff. The mixed game dilemma arises because there are not only several different total values available to the parties, but there are also alternate sharing ratios. A party cannot assume that a larger total value necessarily enhances his individual share."[49] There are four overall strategic possibilities: "(1) Party may select an I, integrative strategy to increase the joint gain, accompanied by an S, a relatively soft strategy in allocating shares. (2) Party may choose D, fixed sum, followed by H hard bargaining in allocating the sum; in effect he maintains a consistent distributive or competitive orientation. (3) Party may choose D, fixed sum, and then follow with an S, soft bargaining strategy in share distribution. (4) Party may select an I, integrative strategy to increase the joint gain, and then select an H, hard bargaining strategy to gain the lion's share of the joint gain.[50] ...In mixed bargaining...cooperation and competition are inextricably combined throughout the search and consideration of an array of potential outcomes. The parties are motivated to cooperate in an active, creative, problem-solving way in order to create maximum values but are also motivated to take competitive steps in order to insure themselves of high individual outcomes."[51]

The literature on consortia emphasizes the need for bargaining and compromise. As examples, Lyman Glenny of the Illinois Board of Higher Education says that the success of voluntary coordination requires unanimity, that one does not ignore a dissatisfied member. "The other members cajole, persuade, and compromise because if one dissident member takes unilateral action, he can wreck the coordinated effort in the state budget offices and in the legislature."[52]

---

[49] Ibid., p. 162.

[50] Ibid., p. 164.

[51] Ibid., p. 167.

James Paltridge suggests that when a number of "representatives" meet on the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, "Council decisions....involve modifications of strongly entrenched institutional interests,"[53] and bargaining will result. Also "decisions on matters of common or shared institutional interests will be arrived at...on the basis of analytic staff studies."[54]

As the investigator has attempted to demonstrate in this chapter, the theoretical framework is simply a heuristic device for conceptualizing relationships among individuals and through them, among organizations engaged in a voluntary collaborative arrangement. As such, the transactions can be reviewed on a number of levels: the individual and the organizational, within as well as between the involved colleges and universities.

The object of this study is the development of administrative guidelines and the formulation of theoretical hypotheses based on the relationships of organizations as assumed through the device. Since the study is exploratory, the researcher did not want to force closure by strict adherence to a theoretical position. It would be most accurate to say that the framework provided a reference point for the excursion.

---

[52] Lyman Glenny, Autonomy of Public Colleges, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1959, p. 256.

[53] James G. Paltridge, California's Coordinating Council for Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1966, p. 153.

[54] Ibid.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This is an exploratory study utilizing the case approach for the purpose of learning as much as possible about the properties of consortia. Because so little is known both about consortia and interorganizational theory, it was decided that the present study, which is conceived to be the beginning of a major research effort, should be oriented toward gaining a large range of detail, and uncover manifest and latent patterns of behavior.

It was decided that two consortia would be studied intensively through non-participant observation for between two to three months each in order for the investigator to gather a wide range of detail. In addition, after the major studies had been completed, the investigator planned and has studied three other consortia for one to two weeks each. The purposes of the latter investigations has been the informal testing of hypotheses growing out of the first studies, providing contrasts and clarifications to ideas that were being formed, and the delineation of new issues and problems that the intensive studies had not uncovered.

There are well over a thousand formal consortia in the United States, making objects of study readily available. The first intensive case study, "The Association," was an expedient rather than a carefully-planned choice. The investigator had applied for funding during summer

1968 but in order to begin the field work before the contract was signed, had to select an organization that would not entail great costs to study. However, in retrospect, the consortium was extremely rich in details, in problems, in theoretical potential, and it is an excellent example of its type of system.

The second through fifth case studies were chosen because of systems properties. Although the large number of consortia types as defined by structural and functional variability precluded a "scientific sampling," the investigator attempted to study a variety of intercollegiate arrangements.

SELECTION OF CASES

Case I.--"The Association," structurally, is a multilateral college center where equality among members is explicitly assumed. The activities were mainly in administrative rather than academic areas during the organization's early years, but faculty programs have predominated recently, and there is also some student interaction. This nine member chartered group is regional within a state.

Case II.--"The Masters-Lewis Project" is a bilateral between a research university in the Northern United States and a Negro college in the Deep South: inequality and reciprocity are assumed by the participants. The Project is oriented toward academic rather than administrative improvements and represents interaction between two national regions.

Case III.--"The St. Thomas-Sacred College Program" represents bilateral cooperation in one important academic area--a joint graduate program--which necessitates interaction among staff, faculty, and students. The interaction flows within one region in the state.

Case IV.--"The University Center" is a multilateral college center between two polar types of colleges, but in the area of extension education. Interaction is among staff only, and it is statewide in make-up.

Case V.--"The Institute for Urban Educational Problems," was an academically oriented multilateral relationship which losts its consortium emphasis. The investigator was interested in the change process in this Institute whose original members are located in one urban area.

There are a number of consortia typologies noted in the bibliography, but the most recent and complete, and the directory relied upon, is Raymond S. Moore, A Guide to Higher Education Consortiums: 1965-1966, OE-50051, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

THE FIELD WORK

Many of the field work experiences, including entree problems and methods, and interaction dynamics, will be described in Chapter VII,. At this point, however, the methodology of the field work will be noted in order for the reader to be aware of how the evidence presented in the following chapters.

After being admitted to the organizations, following one or more letters of intent and explanation[2] and preliminary discussions about the

---

1. In Moore, inter-collegiate relationships are classified with regard to a variety of useful variables--e.g. purpose, type of interchange. Although some arrangements between research universities and small white and Negro colleges funded under Title III of the Higher Education Act, 1965 are listed in Moore, a complete and up-to-date directory is available from the Developing Institutions Branch, Division of College Support, Bureau of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education.

2. See Appendix for a typical letter requesting entree.

consortium, the investigator spent the first segment in the field studying historical documents. Anonymity and confidentiality were assured.

For the intensive studies this amounted to approximately two weeks for the first and one and one-half weeks for the second study. The investigator read all of the office files that he desired to read, which were the total current files, as well as much out-of-date material. The investigator did not have access to private files located in desk drawers, but many documents appearing in the open files contained sensitive information.

At first the investigator consumed everything, but after seeing repetitive documents, such as meeting agendas, he skimmed and read selectively. Included in the material were program activity evaluations, committee minutes, personal correspondence, and budgets. In short, the literature provided the researcher with an abundance of information which not only sensitized him to the characteristics of the program, persons, and colleges involved, but also provided the base for the initial interviews. Notes on the files with regard to standard content, such as minutes, and extraordinary, pertinent, or sensitive data, were taken by the researcher.

Considerably less time was spent in the literature review of the shorter case studies--between half and one and one-half days. For Case III the file included a few booklets and one manila folder; for Case IV, the director was somewhat hesitant to allow the researcher to roam at will, but did provide sensitive evaluations, comprehensive statistics, and documents that were requested. The researcher spent one and one-half days in the archives of the arrangement described in Case V. Although most of the documents read were "official," he did have access to confidential reports circulated among the top administrative officers.

The investigator began the interviewing following the review of documents. The period of time in the field was from August 15, 1968 to April 1, 1969. A total of 160 interviews were conducted, 95 with participants in the first case study.

For the intensive analyses, the interviewees were personally contacted by telephone a week to a week and one-half before an interview was desired and an appointment made. The researcher explained that he was a Cornell doctoral student engaged in an exploratory study of consortia, that the study had been approved by the director of the coordinated effort, that the college president was aware of the study, and that the confidentiality of the interview would be maintained.

A similar statement was made in the interview situation. The researcher indicated he wanted to learn as much as possible about consortia in order to formulate hypotheses and asked a basic open-ended question about the interviewee's involvement. For example, "Will you tell me how you are involved and your feelings about your participation in the consortium"? Areas were probed that were of intrinsic interest and especially those relating to what other people had mentioned or which appeared in the files. The investigator informed his interviewees that he had spent time reading documents and had interviewed other people as a method for improving the accuracy of the interviews.

For the intensive case studies, both key and non-key people were interviewed. There was an attempt to include respondents from all echelons of the consortia and its member organizations who were in some degree involved, at one time or another, with the program. Interviews were held with college presidents, administrative officers, faculty, and in one case, a laboratory technician. The enterprises studied intensively were fairly extensive operations, the first, for instance, involving approximately 180 people. For these studies, the investigator chose to focus on specific committees or activities inasmuch as interviews were not held with every participant.

The interviews averaged fifty minutes to an hour in length, few were as short as a half-hour, but many lasted one and one-half to two hours. Some major interviews with central or key personnel took three hours and more. The norm was one interview with each person, but key people were interviewed more than once, if possible. The interviews were held on the campuses, in the offices of the involved participants or in the centers' headquarters for central staff personnel.

Interviews followed the same procedures for the less intensive studies except that emphasis was placed on interviewing key rather than non-key personnel.

During the beginning of the initial case study, the researcher took verbatim notes of the interviewees' responses. However, he found himself writing answers when he should have been asking questions. When, after an unproductive session, the interviewee said that he had wished his answers had not been written, it was decided that notes be taken after the interview had been conducted. During the remainder of the first case study, the researcher retained key words and phrases that the interviewee spoke and wrote from memory within two hours of the interview.

On subsequent occasions, the researcher encountered individuals who believed that their responses lacked value because they were not being recorded; he therefore decided to be eclectic in taking notes during interviews.

The interviewer felt he was able to sense the mental state of the interviewee soon after contact; usually during the first ten minutes of general conversation and initial questioning. If a person lacked security or feared repercussions of his statements, no notes were taken, but full attention was paid to cultivating a continuing interview. On the other hand, the researcher was interviewing in academic settings where his purposes were better accepted and understood than is the situation in many organizations. Thus, note taking was seen as concomitant with his purpose.

Also, notes were taken with those whom the investigator had prolonged contact, such as consortium staff; they were more likely to be taken with faculty and middle administrators in order to build up the import of the lower participants; they were less likely to be taken with college presidents so as not to stress status differentials with key people.

The researcher was unable to gain permission to observe more than two committee meetings during the first case study. Not only was the investigator not admitted to the more important group sessions, but there are also few committee meetings and interactions in consortia settings.

WRITING AND ANALYZING

The interviews were typed from the handwritten notes as soon as possible--usually the evening following the interview and no later than three days following. At times, very heavy interview schedules and travelling precluded immediate typing.

The interview and historical data amounted to a mass of information. For all case studies, the data collected for each one were studied intensively and the mass reduced by the researcher--recording ideas, anecdotes, significant episodes that might amount to a total of 400 "items." These "items" were grouped into natural piles, the piles organized into an outline for each study, and then each pile outlined for writing purposes. The cases were written according to this method.

The first case was written following the termination of interviews for the second case study. The second and succeeding cases were written following termination of field work in mid-spring of 1969. The analysis appearing in Chapter VIII is based both on the individual cases and the data as a whole.

CHAPTER IV

THE ASSOCIATION

The Association is a group of nine institutions of higher learning in the Northeast United States. This multilateral group is structured as a college center and functions mainly in administrative, rather than academic areas, although the latter is receiving a great deal more attention now than when the group began in 1961.

The investigator will first discuss the history and background of this effort: its founding, purposes, and a statistical outline of the individual institutions. In succeeding sections he will examine the Association's environment, Central Staff, Board of Trustees, and the programming process.

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

It is of major importance to identify a project's locus of initiation in order to determine individual commitments. The idea for the Association came from a wealthy benefactor who, concerned with education and its advancement in general, with the development of educational institutions in his section of the state, and with establishing a means of equitably meeting the financial needs of the local colleges, brought the idea of inter-institutional cooperation to five college presidents. His orientation was mainly "external," his interest in education was widely known, although there was some self-interest involved--an arrangement would ease the pressures on him for individual giving. Also, he was peripherally involved--he would not reap the major benefits of such a pattern and had no intentions of doing so.

He sponsored a trip to another college center for the five presidents, orienting them to the advantages inherent in such a pattern, gave each institution $1,500 to investigate the validity and potentiality of a similar arrangement for itself, and after exploratory meetings, the group decided to incorporate.

It was becoming known in academic circles that foundations and government agencies were favoring consortia for grants purposes. The appetites and needs of individual colleges were becoming more and more expensive to satisfy, and cooperative endeavors smacked of "efficiency." The potential for collaboration was great, and joint projects were more easily funded than individual requests.

During the first years, 1961-1963, the member colleges assessed themselves of a total of $24,000, while the benefactor either personally or through his corporation contributed a total of $100,000.

By the fall of 1962 the Association's Director reported to the Board of Trustees that the central funds were being expended too rapidly and that sufficient planning and support for obtaining new grants had not been evident. He indicated that he "followed up" possibilities for foundation help, but sizable grants were not indicated. Then, after appealing to his board members to make routine formal appeals themselves or through their development officers, he finally had the group agree to have these development officers assemble to discuss a common approach in appealing for central funds.

Initially, the institutional presidents were "internally" and "peripherally" involved.

PURPOSE AND ACTIVITIES

The purposes of the Association, according to the articles of incorporation are:

> a. To act and serve primarily as an organization through and by means of which individual colleges and universities may by joint and united action (1) more effectively and efficiently achieve and carry out their separate corporate purposes and aims, (2) to develop, promote and maintain programs and projects in support of their separate educational programs, including those which may be beyond the means or abilities of any one college or university and (3) enlist the cooperation of other area educational and cultural institutions in educational programs beneficial to the area in which such colleges and universities are located.

This provisional charter was made absolute in 1966, signifying that in the eyes of the state "the corporation (had acquired) resources and equipment available for its use and support and sufficient for its chartered purposes...and (were) maintaining an institution of educational usefulness and character...."

The Association is composed of a number of committees whose members hold administrative positions within the individual colleges, although faculty are represented on the special interest groups: academic deans, admissions deans, personnel deans, advisors to student government, arts program, atelier studio in Paris, business managers, CORD representatives (educational research grant), development officers, foreign area studies, international education, librarians, nursing directors, publicity officers, registrars, research council (grants to faculty), scholarly journal, scientists, summer sessions director, visiting scholars representatives; and departmental chairman in English, history, economics and business administration, and sociology/anthropology. In essence, two types of committees are represented: those whose functions are the distribution of rewards and the others which have a problem-solving orientation.

The Association, through the initiative of the Central Staff and the committees, sponsored a variety of activities and meetings during the first few years: block-booking of artists, travelling lecturers, a national conference on institutional cooperation (funded by the Fund for the Advancement of Education), a programmed learning workshop, research grants to faculty from member institutions, a student leader workshop, conferences for secondary school guidance counselors, faculty seminars, a coordinated evening session bulletin, as well as periodic meetings of administrative officers from the associated colleges.

In addition to these events, a major feature and activity for the Association was broached by a local corporation with world-wide activities, in the summer of 1964. Although unrelated, except in a minor way, to all of the member colleges, it was decided to place a Graduate Center under the Association umbrella--to serve the needs of the community, the sponsoring corporation, and other local industry. This activity will not be discussed later inasmuch as it does not relate to the college program. However, it is important to recognize that the Graduate Center gives legitimization to the Association as a whole. It creates activity for the Association, gives it a daily purpose, as opposed to periodic college oriented programming, provides public relations material, and opens doors to local industry for grants, which are slow in coming. The Association treats this major project as it does all others in its annual reports--part of the normal consortium operation.

In the latest semester, Fall 1968, eleven credit courses and six continuing education seminars attracted students from twelve school districts, four colleges, two churches, one library, and three government departments. The local sponsoring industry supplied more than half of the 300 enrollees and contributed over $400,000 during the first three years of operation, 1965-1968. It is estimated that continued operation to the spring of 1971 will cost this industry another $550,000.

The Graduate Center does not have the authority to grant degrees, only the involved institutions can do so as individual colleges and universities. Although an Association spokesman indicated that a strong Graduate Center may produce fears in relation to the development of graduate degree programs in the consortium institutions, he pointed to the Center's specific objectives and clientele. Nevertheless, expansion in its evening courses could negatively affect enrollment in one member college's evening division which has a higher tuition fee. In addition, enlargement could take a greater commitment of staff time to the dismay of consortium presidents who feel, at present, that the Center is not detrimental to the Association given the limited claims it has on its resources.

There is great potential in the future of this activity. Two of the five colleges who give courses are Association members. With an expansion of involved colleges and a curriculum with a wider range than the engineering, business administration, English, and education courses now offered, it could become the capstone of the consortium. It could develop a unique program by utilizing the resources of the member colleges for a super-masters or teaching doctorate. However, the probabilities of such potentialities becoming realized are very low.

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS--STATISTICS

There are five charter members of the Association, one disaffiliated and five joined since 1961. The terms of membership include the following: the prospective colleges must agree to participate fully in various planning committees but not necessarily participate in every project, pledge careful deliberations in use of the Association's funds, agree to active support of the President of the Association in fund raising, promptly pay their dues, and attend board of trustees meetings.

University A (joined in 1961).[1]--This institution, chartered in 1857, is privately controlled, non-sectarian, and has programs in liberal arts, nursing, and ceramics. It has a 140,000 volume library, a faculty-student ratio of one to twelve, with 60% of the teaching staff holding doctorates.

There are 1025 men and 475 women. The means of the SAT are 550V and 575M with 30% of the incoming class in the top 10%, and 90% in the top 50% of their high school classes. Twenty percent of the student body is from out-of-state.

---

[1] The statistical information was compiled from James Cass and Max Birnbaum, Comparative Guide to American Colleges for Students, Parents, Counselors, Harper and Row, New York, 1965; Gene R. Hawes, The New American Guide to Colleges, Columbia University Press, New York, 1966; Clarence E. Lovejoy, Lovejoy's College Guide, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1968.

College B (joined in 1961).--This is a co-educational, publically controlled community college founded in 1956 and has the traditional mixture of liberal arts and technical programs. It has a 35,000 volume library, faculty-student ratio of one to twenty, with 25% of the faculty holding doctorates.

There are 1,000 men and 750 women with a SAT V and M range of 400-750. Twenty percent of the freshmen are in the top 10% and 75% in the top 50% of their high school classes, with 70% of the graduates continuing to four-year institutions. Ten percent of the student body is from out-of-state.

College C (joined in 1961).--This college is a women's, nonsectarian, private, liberal arts institution founded in 1855. Its library has 100,000 volumes, and it has a faculty-student ratio of one to fifteen with 56% of the staff holding doctorates.

The 1,200 women have a SAT V mean of 560 with 40% of the freshmen in the top 10% and 90% in the top 50% of their high school classes. Forty-eight percent of the students are from out-of-state.

Colleges D (joined in 1961).--These are coordinated private liberal arts colleges founded in 1822 and 1908 respectively which, although nondenominational, are affiliated with a church. The library holds 118,000 volumes, the faculty-student ratio is one to thirteen and 50% of the teachers hold doctorates.

There are just over 1,000 men and 400 women, the V mean in the male college is 570 and the M average is 600. Forty percent of the freshmen are in the top 5%, and 70% are in the top 50% of their high school classes. These colleges attract 40% of their student body from out-of-state.

College E (joined in 1962).--This institution, founded in 1892, is a co-educational, private college with programs in the liberal arts, music, and physical education. It has 112,000 volumes in its library, a faculty-student ratio of one to fourteen, with 40% of the staff holding doctorates.

There are 1,750 men and 1,750 women with SAT V and M means of 575. Ten percent of their students are in the top 10% and 75% in the 50% of their high school classes. Thirty-five percent of the students in this institution are from out-of-state.

College F (joined in 1962).--College F, founded in 1890, is a women's independent, liberal arts institution, which is church affiliated but non-sectarian. It's library holds 53,000 volumes, and it has a one to twelve student-faculty ratio with 30% of its staff holding doctorates.

Its 850 women have a SAT V and M mean of 550, with 94% of the incoming class in the top 50% of their high school classes. This institution has 43% of its students from outside the state.

College G (joined in 1966).--A women's private, independent, two year college founded in 1824 with liberal arts and professional studies; it has a 20,000 volume library, a one to fourteen student-faculty ratio, with 17% of the faculty with doctorates.

The student body of 590 has a combined SAT V and M mean of 880. The college accepts 3 1/2% of their students from the top 10% and 32% from the top 50% of their high school classes, and 37% are from out-of-state.

College H (joined in 1966).--This private, co-educational, four year college, with liberal arts and professional programs, was founded in 1928, and severed its church connections in 1968. It has library holdings of 72,000 volumes, a student-faculty ratio of one to eighteen, and 36% of its faculty hold doctorates.

It has a student body of 760 men and 800 women, a SAT mean of 550, accepts 40% from the top 10% and 95% from the top 50% of their high school classes. Twenty-three percent of the students come from out-of-state.

College I (joined in 1966).--This is a women's, non-sectarian, liberal arts college founded in 1868. It has library holdings of 148,000 volumes, a one to ten student-faculty ratio, with 75% of the teachers holding doctorates.

Six hundred women are in this college, and they have a SAT V and M mean of 600. Fifty-six percent of the student body are in the top 10% and 97% in the top 50% of their high school classes, and 50% are from out-of-state.

College J (joined in 1961 and disaffiliated in 1964).--This co-educational state institution was founded in 1857 and is a liberal arts college with major emphasis in teacher preparation. It has a library of 73,000 volumes, a one to fourteen student-faculty ratio, with 22% of the staff holding doctorates.

There are 2,200 students with a SAT combined mean of 1025. Fifteen percent of its freshmen are in the top 10% and 75% in the top 50% of their high school classes. Ten percent of the students are from out-of-state.

Most of the institutions are private liberal arts colleges with students who rate similarly on SAT scores. However, there are major differences among the schools, and these are related to problems that the consortium faces. The difficulties will be discussed in detail when the study deals with the individual colleges as social institutions.

These sections have attempted to impart an orientation to the Association--its founding, purposes, early programs, and a profile of the membership. The environment in which it is located is discussed in the following section, and its influence on inter-institutional cooperation will be examined.

THE ENVIRONMENT

There are geographical, political, social, and "professional" environments within which a voluntary association exists.

THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

The literature on consortia stresses the importance of the proximity of institutions who maintain voluntary programs. And it is right for emphasis to be placed on this point: geographic proximity is functional for cooperation, unless a mechanical communications system exists to off-set the problem of distance. Sharing facilities and exchanging students or professors for a period or a day, committee meetings--all are more difficult or even impossible because of a large radius among the Association's Colleges. And, of course, an aura of interdependence is more difficult to attain when the closest institutions are more than twenty miles and the furthest eighty-five miles apart. One way trips of two hours limit interaction, and if a central location is agreed upon for all schools, this would prevent most of the colleges from hosting meetings on their campuses. Not only are meetings missed, many times, because of distance involved, but travel time serves as a convenient excuse for those who are only periphally involved in the consortium's activities. This is not to deny a cost on the part of those travelling: for many people an entire day is devoted to a two hour meeting, meaning lost time for one's institutional business and fatigue.

The time commitment involved in travelling affects the initiation of new ideas as well as meeting representation. In at least one case, an admissions officer lost an opportunity to "sell" an idea on the agenda, his idea, because of absence due to travelling problems.

Distance also affects the possibility of what faculty will administer programs. Many of the projects chaired by faculty are done by those in institutions closest to the headquarters; it certainly allows administrative activities to be more efficiently conducted and causes less resentment and work if the central secretaries can type and duplicate program materials. One faculty member complained bitterly about the lack of administrative attention he received for the program he conducted, a situation which would have been avoided if he could have worked closely with the center.

In addition location affects the possibility of gaining hard resources from the environment. Local industry do not see a "natural consortia" in their region and do not favor contributions to it; they would rather give to the individual colleges, who do not object to that arrangement. Lack of proximity puts just one more burden on the Association President when he solicits gifts.

Furthermore, proximity affects the willingness of institutions to share equipment. Many such ideas were initiated by the center with regard to computing and scientific hardware, but the proposed locations were too far from the colleges, the members thought, for equitable use. A psychological distance may be harder to breech than a physical one.

A standard argument for cooperation among colleges is that of efficiency, usually with regard to purchasing common items of maintenance and equipment. However, distance between colleges lessens this potentiality. Many of the business officers of the Association's colleges feel that the financial costs, and the cost of control, for operating a central distribution point, complete with vehicles and personnel, would outweigh the savings. And, in addition, these staff members see potential conflict: what college would receive first delivery?

Time between points is only one consideration when establishing consortia. The second is the natural transportation regions or "psychological regions" in the state. A major highway running through a state very likely affects thinking about the regionalism of sister institutions in that section, regardless of the time it takes to reach them. With regard to the Association, the member institutions are scattered in different "logical regions" which affects their perceptions of commonality. College A, for instance, is establishing a study center in a major city in the Western portion of the state where it identifies itself, rather than in the central section where the Association headquarters is located. A number of members are joining a state association in the western sector rather than in the south-central area.

The importance of regionalism was demonstrated when the admissions officer's committee was planning a heavy schedule for secondary school guidance counselors visiting the Association's colleges. The committee suggested that the visitation be split in half, with each group observing colleges within two geographical regions; but the idea was vetoed by the Board of Trustees.

The Association membership is linked psychologically by some rather large bodies of water around which some of the institutions are located. But, lacking bridges, this potential unifying point hinders rather than spurs interaction.

Consortia must also consider the weather factors and the urban-rural situation.

The winters in the Association's locale are severe and after late fall, meetings are arranged on the remote rural campuses only with caution. There is evidence that some committees arrange their meeting schedule so as to visit these remote institutions during the spring; but many times, these colleges' representatives cannot leave their campuses to travel to other institutions during the winter months.

The Association initiated a library processing center in 1968 and located it centrally, as well as in an urban environment. It is of some significance for urban areas to be part of the consortium region when large centralized facilities are planned. Cities are attractive in recruiting staff, and have established transportation systems facilitating acceptance of and delivery of commodities to members. Adequate air facilities also aid in travelling scholars programs by providing links with the cosmopolitan centers from where the lecturers usually come.

THE POLITICAL-SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

The physical environment--geography, transportation, urban-rural, weather--has the significance usually attributed to it. However, the constraints resulting from the political-social environment usually receive less attention.

The political complexities of the state and nation affect the viability of the consortium. As was indicated earlier, one of the original members disaffiliated three years after joining. College J is in a state adjacent to the one in which the consortium is located, although it is only thirty miles away. The major reason for leaving the group was its state's attitude toward public money leaving the political area and entering another jurisdiction. There were also bureaucratic difficulties; for instance, the college needed official approval thirty days before a vehicle could leave the state, which was usually impossible to arrange.

On the other hand, the political attitude if positive, can help insure success. The chancellor of the public higher educational system in the state in which the Association is located came out publically in favor of state institutional involvement in private consortia. He suggested for instance, "the novel possibility of creating a new kind of graduate centers by combining the staffs from both the public and private universities." Thus, the position of the state-supported institution in the consortium is secure, if only from a political perspective.

Needless to say, the strength of the economy influences the availability of foundation and government support. The Association looks ahead to a bleak year because of the Viet-nam war and a profit decline for some of its basic contributors. Since the individual colleges rely on similar sources of support, the differential will not be able to come from this sector, and the viability of the Association is going to be tested rather severely.

As the financial support problem so clearly indicates, environmental concern is needed to stimulate activity. But in many cases, it is not the positive support which has the main effect of spurring cooperation, but the issue of the individual institution's survival in the environment which motivates the representatives to band together.

A negative rather than positive motivation, the issue of survival, can obtain on two levels. Either it can be survival as prestige schools or simple economic survival which is at issue. In neither case are the Association's colleges threatened. Although some of the colleges, notably Colleges D and I, are fairly prestigious nationally, the others are neither on a high prestige base nor learning toward the periphery in declining prestige.

Although these institutions are facing greater and greater competition from the state institutions for new candidates, the admissions officers report that conditions are not yet too severe, that standards have not been noticeably lowered. The President of College C reported contingency plans which would have gone into effect last year if admissions had fallen below a certain level. But they did not. This is not to say the potential problem is not serious, but it is expected to become worse.

The state commissioned a study of the private higher educational system and substantiated the impressions of the Association's college presidents. The commission reported, "Our own best judgment is that their needs are real and important but in most cases not desperate." Among the recommendations made was the establishment of a planning grant fund by the state "for the purpose of stimulating inter-institutional cooperation, public and private," finding at present, "little evidence of inter-institutional cooperation on the scale necessary to achieve significant educational and economic advantages."

The Association met with guest visitors to ponder the significance of the study. However, the report mainly was a call for state action to aid the private colleges rather than being addressed to the separate institutions.

It should be noted that social support to a consortium can have a negative influence, rather than no influence, on colleges which are not part of the voluntary agreements.

A Federal governmental agency funded a Consortium Research Grant for the Association, providing "seed money" for faculty in the area of educational research. The agency verbally guaranteed that proposals "seeded" under the grant would receive preferential treatment when they were to be judged as full-fledged proposals for regular research funds. Although the agency wants to guarantee that proposals "seeded" by one of its grants will be more heavily funded under another when it comes "of age" this potentially limits the amount of funds for non-members inasmuch as the funding agency has a limited budget. This procedure also addresses itself to the topic of equality versus quality, the government in this case, desiring to strengthen the small colleges, but in order to do so, having to deal with the poorer schools on their level. Later in the paper this issue will be discussed with regard to internal research funding in the consortium.

The influences listed above have been mainly political-educational. However, in the realm of the purely social, there are societal laws, and norms and behavior patterns which must change if consortia are to function most effectively.

Postal regulations limit mailings on a permit to non-taxable institutions for that organization's literature. Thus, one admissions officer had a large number of common public relations mailings designed and printed by the Association for his use which he felt could not be legitimately mailed. These admissions officers also face difficulty when visiting high schools for recruiting purposes. Although the argument is often made that admissions people ought to recruit for all the consortium's colleges as well as their own, high school guidance officers give limited amounts of time to any one "representative" on a visitation. Thus, there is the feeling that a recruiter's specific aims would be compromised by fulfilling the larger purpose, that an accomodation would be difficult. There is also the feeling on the part of admissions people that personal exchanges with guidance counselors, which have been built over the years, would be threatened by enlarging the opportunities for rewards by the secondary school officer.

Colleges and universities may belong to more than one consortium; thus, the judgment as to the scope of any one of them must be made in full knowledge of the total relationships. Many of the members of the Association belong to a statewide fund-raising foundation that not only modifies the need for development officers in the Association to join forces for similar reasons, but also creates a dilemma as how to treat the potential donors who might be solicited by the same people representing two voluntary consortia. There is also a statewide commission on independent colleges which acts as a spokesman for the private sector. And, in fact, the state study group mentioned previously recommended that it be recognized as "the voice of the private institutions." Also, many of the Association's colleges participate in a common purchasing plan outside of the consortium. It should be noted that inasmuch as some Association institutions do and others do not belong, the potential needs of the excluded probably would not be met within the subject voluntary group.

Not only do outside consortia fulfill functions for the members of the Association, they also compete with the Association. A statewide library processing center nearly came into being, and would have had, and still may have implications for the viability of the Association's center. Not only would the support of College B be in question, but contracts from non-members would be more difficult to obtain. The state also operates an admissions system whereby a student can apply to more than one state college simultaneously. College B has fought inclusion in that plan and would be hard put to explain participation in a similar Association plan should it materialize.

It should be noted that the Association, as any organization, tries to co-opt and bargain with the other elements with which it is competing.[2] It is hoped by the Central Staff that the processing center will soon begin negotiating with the state, to have the larger system utilize the Association's facilities. A state system would represent a potentially significant threat to the processing center's viability.

Not only do individual colleges belong to numerous consortia and could they be in competition, but there are a number of relationships between the individual institutions which may or may not have been initiated through the channels of the subject consortium. The admissions officers contact each other and other colleges not in the Association when they have a "find" that they cannot accommodate themselves. The two-year colleges attempt to establish a relationship with the four-year institutions in the Association so as to have a place for their transfer

---

2. See James D. Thompson and William J. McEwen, "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal Setting as an Interaction Process," American Sociological Review, 23:26-28.

students. College D and E have cooperated in a photography course. These contacts are not initiated under the Association umbrella, but they are more likely to be made because of the Association.

Outside contacts among the colleges have negative as well as positive implications. An administrator at one of the Association's colleges had a negative attitude toward course sharing with another member just one half hour away. This person had had some poor experience with this school when trying to establish a similar program outside of the relationship.

It was indicated that the Association is open to contacts with colleges outside the consortium. The Central Staff, trying to build these relationships into more permanent ones, do not charge higher rental rates for using the Association's facilities than the use-fees placed on consortium members. In one instance, a major university used a research vessel belonging to the Association but some members feel that it should have been charged a higher rate. They feel that advantages of belonging are being compromised. However, negotiations for areas of cooperation with this institution have been partially successful. On the one hand, this institution wants full payment for any services rendered including contributions to its research library's acquisition department if the library is officially used by the Association's colleges. However, there is a joint sociology project developing between this research university and the Association colleges, where both have to gain. Financial considerations will not be made with the contracting schools for the library processing center; they will be charged a higher rate because only financial gains are seen as accruing from these sources.

The individual colleges have commitments to the local "communities" which prevent utilizing the potential of the Association. Many schools have trustees who, being insurance agents, have first claim on their institutions, preventing a common and efficient insurance plan from being instituted. College E faced extinction a decade ago and might very well have expired if it had not been for debt forgiveness on the part of the local merchants. In addition, the school operates a strong booster association which brings in thousands of dollars in contributions. It is natural then for a commitment to local purchasing to be strong. This institution has an obligation prior to any with the Association in this regard.

Finally, it is suggested that programs sponsored in the consortium, the colleges' environment, both force and focus change, rather than being mere additional program areas for the member institutions. Dues charged the Association members are returned to the colleges for visiting lecture programs and research activities that were either non-existent or much smaller activities before consortium involvement. Both programs have implications for radically changing the environment and expectations of students and faculty.

In addition, a very complete study was made by the consortium in the area of fringe benefits for the Central Staff. It certainly acquainted the institutional presidents with an equitable package and provided a good reference for analyzing one's benefits on the home campus.

THE PROFESSIONAL ENVIRONMENT

The last environmental influence considered is that of the professional groups to which the Association representatives belong.

Some functional groups have strong professional organizations which negate the need for consortium activity. The development officers, for instance, have a strong group in the central section of the state. Thus, "tips" and advice are exchanged freely outside the Association, and the consortium's committee has a reduced potential of activity.

The changing nature of the professional field creates the basis for cooperation. Librarians are spurred to cooperate because of the radical changes in their craft promised in the next few years; faculty cooperate in introductory disciplinary seminars because of the changes occurring within disciplines. There are a number of Association faculty groups that invite noted speakers to give introductory talks in a disciplinary subspecialty.

The norms of a professional group affect the cooperative potential. The business managers conceive of much of their information as confidential and do not want to share it with counterparts in other institutions, although they do want to know where they stand in relationship to each other in some areas; academic deans traditionally question proposals and initiate little, and never meet in the consortium although they constitute an active committee; librarians are embued with a spirit of service and cooperation and are the most smoothly functioning and fruitful committee of all. Thus, professional criteria affects interaction within a consortium.

It should also be noted that consortium programs are limited to what is seen as "professional" behavior within the different professional groups. The admissions officers, for instance, would not have a common interview location for prospective students or advertise for undergraduate interviews since this is considered improper within their framework. There are varying opinions as to what is professional conduct and a professional role. The Association's public relations committee agree on little because the individuals are split into two camps--those who feel that public relations is self-serving propaganda, and those who believe it has an educational value for the community and a policy-making role for the organization. These polar positions prevent communication and subsequent projects from developing.

This then is the influence of the political, social, geographic, and professional environments on the consortium. The Association's Central Staff will now be examined.

THE ORGANIZATION

THE CENTRAL STAFF

Background

The Association's staff consists of four full-time administrators, one librarian for the graduate center, two executive secretaries who are in charge of graduate program and bookkeeping functions, a secretary to the president, and some peripheral personnel, not including the library processing center staff. The full-time administrators include the president of the Association, an assistant to the president who is also in charge of public relations, a dean of administration for the Graduate Center who is also the Director of the Research Development Program, based on a government grant, and a program associate who works with various committees and has a part to play in an amazing variety of activities. The division of labor is not strict--most staff members are involved with aspects of the program that are not their official responsibilities. That this occurs in a small staff located in a converted personal residence, separate from any member campus, is to be expected.

To date there have been three presidents. Reasons for the resignation of the first are unclear, but the second was asked to leave because of conflicts with the institutional presidents.

In correspondence with the Board before joining the staff, the former president made it clear that he wanted to be in a leadership position and not subservient to the college presidents in administering the consortium. He received such assurances, which in fact did not materialize. A few months after his appointment in November 1964, he outspokenly indicated to the Trustees that they spent too much time on the consortium's administrative details and he desired a clarification of his and their responsibilities. He also had to work with a shortage of staff and a recalcitrant bookkeeper, which negatively affected his output. And after telling the Trustees that they were presidents of "small" colleges, both they and he sought a change.

The Current President

The incumbent president of the Association, having experienced some personal conflict in his previous position as admissions director in a member college and with a desire to influence the educational scene in this country, joined the staff in 1965. His credentials are very respectable: a B.A. from a prestigious liberal arts undergraduate institution, Phi Beta Kappa, a Rhodes Scholarship, and a doctorate in international affairs from a major university.

Of great significance is a clarification of the president's responsibilities, as they actually are and as others feel they should be, in order to both understand his behavior and the problems of the Association.

A review of the Association's files and the Board of Trustees minutes points to an amazing variety of tasks with which the President becomes involved: he asks the provost of one institution if he would be interested in hosting a state sponsored seminar, he pursues the possibility of a systems study of the consortium, asks institutional presidents for faculty nominations to seminars, sends a check to a visiting professor, asks a University of Chicago professor for suggestions on visiting lecturers, answers registration questions for the summer programs, solicits grants by mail and in person from local corporations and Washington agencies, helps write a proposal to the National Science Foundation, congratulates members of institutions upon promotion, gives views on impending legislation to Congressmen, meets with various Association committees to suggest ideas for new projects, and tries to locate a diesel marine generator for the Association's research vessel.

This list could be expanded, but it is apparent that the President's tasks involve both administrative and leadership functions.

Many administrative personnel have duties which include both routine and innovative areas. The President's difficulty is that he sees himself as an educational leader, desires to establish new programs, and give greater viability to consortia as a form, while his "superiors" on the Board expect him to be an administrative aide carrying out their will, and finding new sources of revenue to keep the center alive. In short, according to the theoretical framework, the President is externally and centrally oriented, while the presidents are internally and peripherally involved.

This dichotomy leads to two major difficulties. First, it raises the issue that the Association has already begun to consider, but has not resolved, as to whether the consortium is a separate entity or whether it is a voluntary association. If the President had to wait until the Board or committees innovated or programmed activity, little would be accomplished. The consortium head desires to enhance, on his initiative, the Association's activities. Some individual presidents, conceiving the President to be an "administrator," object to the publication of an annual report. They visualize a voluntary association, and would rather sit monthly to listen about minor committee activities than actively support the President in charting new courses for the group to follow.

It is presumed that voluntary associations encounter definitional problems after they have been functioning for some time and have built relationships on their own. The Association, not only faces this definitional issue, but does so with "members" who are as sophisticated as the Association President in the operation of an educational organization, and who desire that the consortium become involved in programs that only peripherally affect their campuses. Unlike most voluntary groups, this is no social club or union organization with a less sophisticated membership.

This role dilemma was manifested in the action of a community member of the Board of Trustees who initiated a report on the Association's operation. He recommended that the President be renamed "Dean" and "be responsible for the operation of the central office and the implementation of the policies as determined by the Trustees and the Board of Directors." The President remarked angrily to this diminuation of role as implied by the change in title, and said he would exchange the present one only for "chancellor." The trustee also recommended that a consortium title be chosen that sounded less like an entity and more like a voluntary group.

Not only does the role problem raise the issue of the nature of the consortium, it also affects the manner in which the President conducts himself, regardless of the content of his tasks. Fiedler[3] suggests in his contingency model, that effective leadership results from different mixtures of task and human relations dimensions which are related to the nature of the organization within which one operates. If Fiedler is correct, then contradictory behavior or radical changes in behavioral patterns would be required if one worked for one moment in a voluntary association, and in the next for a monocratic organization, or if one were unsure of the nature of the organization.

---

[3] Fred E. Fiedler, A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967.

Various expectations of behavior are not only suggested by the contingency model; they are, in fact, expected by those in the Association. Those interviewed were asked how they perceived the role of the Association President. He is expected to be aggressive in initiating new programs, a coordinator, a channel of information, an energizer for others, a public relations man, and a diplomat. In the same interview the President described his main role as both initiator and middleman.

In a letter to the president of a member college, he says a consortium president must fight for time with local college activities, and the cooperative usually loses. "This is perhaps natural for power is relative and power is local and all power resides in the individual campuses as far as voluntary cooperation is concerned." The Central Staff must support a college's individual interests, "identifying these interests and relating them to the cooperative program is a necessary task for the administrator." In practice, there is a thin boundary between "identifying" and creating," and it is a frustrating chore when it must be attempted for nine colleges with regard to the same program.

Because of the widely differing demands of the position, it is natural for role conflict to affect the incumbent. Parsons[4] predicts that role conflict will produce anxiety, fantasy, hostility, or hitting out reactions. The President finds himself growing "impatient," "abrupt," "anomic." He feels he is "getting old" and "biting."

---

[4] Talcott Parsons, The Social System, The Free Press, Glencoe, 1951, pp. 404-405.

The theorist believes someone torn by role conflict has a two-fold need: to express resentment or hostility which the frustration arouses and to protect by defensive adjustive measures the cathectic investment in the relationship. Perhaps this explains the following exchange between the Association President and a new college president who had just come to one of his first Board meetings. First, the consortium head apologizes for being a dismal companion after the Board meeting and then tells him of funds (a small unattached grant) which is available to nurture individual talent which the college president can ask for when needed. The President closes by saying, in retrospect he is pleased about the trustees meeting and is proceeding immediately to carry out the decisions reached. He then thanks the new trustee for his contribution to the session.

Also faced with the frustration of dealing with committees who would usually rather exchange polite information then plan programs or investigate the viability of new ideas, he has all but abandoned the committee structure. He works closely with specific representatives, whom he identifies as being interested in the consortium. This strains the organization from being a voluntary group into a monocratic organization with leader delegated tasks to subordinates.

To be explained as a defense mechanism, the President at times ignores suggestions by committees which will upgrade the Association but create problems with a "quick to strike back" Board. For example, to give the consortium the appearance of legitimacy every publication designed for specific programs lists every attraction that ever appeared in similar previous projects. The brochure on the current roster of visiting lecturers lists them from 1961 to the present. The publication on research grants lists this years recipients as well as the first awards. The public relations committee recommended that the format of these publications be changed: there is strict adherence to listing alphabetically by college, which at times, subverts common sense. A booklet has research abstracts, from work accomplished under the Association's grants, which are grouped not by subject, but alphabetically by college. The joint extra-curricular program calendar is not listed by date, but by separate college. The recommended change was for more logical groupings and was ignored by the President; the suggestion which was the result of an effort to comment on consortium publications did not merit a reply to the committee. As a result, some of the committee members felt they were serving a useless function and became less involved in future committee work.

Most college presidents in the Association pity the consortium leader; they know how difficult it would be for them to initiate and negotiate among nine college presidents who have strong feelings about institutional autonomy. The presidents are aware that the frustrating interaction has put the continued incumbency of the Association President in doubt; in fact, they wonder how he has survived so long. And, with questions of tenure raised, a spirit of uncertainty and a greater impetus not to engage in long-range projects seems to be evident among some.

This, at the same time that the President travels incessantly, attempting to attract grants for the organization.

Parsons[5] suggests that goal attainment is not the lone source of gratification, also of significance is the achievement of a value-standard for which ego and alter give their approval. In these terms, the President is quite ungratified.

Other Staff

The problem of definition does not affect the other staff members as it does the President. They were hired for more specific responsibilities--the administration of a grant, bookkeeping, or public relations; but this is not to indicate that conflicts do not arise here.

Although responsible for more specific tasks than the President, the staff members do become involved in a variety of activities--from advising committees, to helping individual members perform consortium functions. The committees that any one person deals with have such divergent aims, contain such a variety of people, that for one person to negotiate successfully among them requires a generalist's approach and a specialist's knowledge.

The public relations staff member, the second in command, is complimented by the public relations committee for his writing, but criticized for his "layout"; he is complimented for devising a general admissions brochure, but chided by the admissions officers for putting in the wrong information and not understanding what is meant by "financial aid" as a broad concept. A staff member is praised for informing colleges about opportunities in educational research, but criticized for not knowing what is meant by that term. A committee advisor feels obliged to plan programs for the English professors because of the few ideas coming from that source. Lacking knowledge of that discipline, his good will will not bring him far.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 423.

There is a more serious problem with the activities of the staff than the need to be generalists and specialists at the same time. Specifically, what with the tenuousness of the colleges' commitment and the need for outside funding, committee activities and scholarship are at times subverted for money-making schemes.

The grossest example of this is the "Scholarly Journal," that has been in the planning stages since 1963. The Board and the Central Staff need a publication to place on the coffee tables of foundations. A committee was formed to look into a research journal toward which faculty from the member colleges could contribute. From the beginning to the present day, the cosmopolitan faculty both on and off the committee say they will not contribute to such an organ, but to their disciplinary journals. The locals, on the other hand, see this as an opportunity for easy publication. The committee was advised by a noted editor that the project is unfeasible for numerous reasons--expense, time commitment, and number of articles needed for backlog being only a few. Yet the committee still remains, most of its "members" being unaware of its existence until it was recently called into session.

The Central Staff is publishing resumes of research projects funded

Pages 71 + 72 Not available

by the Association's research grants. With the "article" supply running low, the faculty was called together to inject spirit into the project. Once again, there were major disagreements as to the "journal's" purpose and format. Those most satisfied with the new attention were those who want to copy the Saturday Review.

The means determine the ends in this Association. Numerous proposals are filed and grants opportunities investigated which if successful determine the nature of the programs. Seldom does deliberation and choice precede application for funds. This not only subordinates the goals to the opportunities, but can be expensive. A meeting of academic deans was called to decide how a small grant should be used. The cost of the meeting based on the salaries of the committee members equaled the amount of the grant.

Continuously "selling" new program ideas, the Central Staff has little chance of success unless the project is financed by outside sources, creates no dissension within the committee, and is peripherally related to the colleges. Given the attainment of these criteria, conflicts result when programs have implications for how the colleges routinely operate. Cataloguers at one institution were upset because the library processing center did it differently. An institution's business manager was annoyed when the staff asked him to arrange his books to account for a consortium grant in accordance with the government auditor's recommendations, and the business managers unfamiliar with new accounting procedures resulting from consortium involvement balked at the changes.

Most conflict by the individual colleges directed toward the staff occurs when one institutional representative does not tell his colleagues at home about arrangements made in the Association. Displaced aggression is directed to the staff for not informing them of the program which affects the member college's operation. It should be noted that, in general, institutional feedback to the staff is irregular, but most predictable when the institutions feel something is about to be or has been decided which affects their interests either negatively or with uncertainty. The president of one institution wrote a scathing letter to the Association after having found out that they planned to write a brochure on all of the colleges' international activities. He did not wish to be included, and a meek letter was returned explaining the project was in the thinking rather than printing stage.

The Central Staff must also negotiate the dilemma of protocol with regard to its interactions in the colleges. A failure may create ill-will but observance may result in the failure of the program. When announcements and bulletins are sent to the colleges, they should be sent to the administration, namely the presidents or academic deans, but this increases the possibility of these communications not reaching their destinations. Thus, the staff sends "information" copies to concerned faculty when mailing correspondence through channels.

A recent staff publications survey made to determine how many of what publications were received and read verified suspicions that there were gaping holes in distribution resulting from a failure to disseminate the literature. Individual mailings to faculty would be prohibitively expensive, as well as fraught with administrative difficulties.

Indicated in this section are some of the reactions that individuals on the consortium's campuses have toward the Association. Raven and Rietsema[6] suggest that the clarity of the group situation affects individual attraction to the group. And the boundaries and policies of the Association lack clarity among a high percentage of those interviewed. They do not know the purposes of the organization and what activities are legitimate possibilities. Of course, there are some individuals who lack faith in the abilities of the Central Staff to speak for them and represent their functions. But a greater percentage complain that the staff never visits the colleges to discover what their needs are. Many "said" they desire conversations with the President, want an opportunity to suggest programs, but are unsure about making contact themselves, or think it may not be their responsibility. In all fairness to the staff it is questionable how open-ended visitations would be accepted by the institutional presidents.

The staff is legally responsible to the Board of Trustees which is composed of the presidents of the member colleges, in addition to a small number of community representatives. It is to this body that the study will now turn its attention.

---

[6] Bertram H. Raven and Jan Rietsema, "The Effects of Varied Clarity of Group Goal and Group Path Upon the Individual and His Relation to His Group," Human Relations, 10:35.

THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Unlike the Association President who has a utopian vision of how he might affect the future of higher education or the benefactor who forsees the beginning of a multi-versity based upon the cooperative endeavors of the member colleges, the individual college presidents joined for the financial benefits that would accrue to their institutions, and because of pressures from some of their institutional trustees.

Whereas the Association President periodically prints lists of potential programs that the members might agree to initiate, the institutional leaders are more interested in moving away from problems than toward known and stated goals; and it may be for this reason that the Association's boundaries are so unclear. Braybrooke and Lindblom[7] characterize this dichotomy as synoptic versus incremental decision-making. The latter strategy is a series of remedial moves on which some agreement can be developed even among institutions of opposing ideological camps. The orientation is not to solve basic problems, but to take the next step. This basic difference in decision-making orientation creates misunderstandings and communications gaps between the Board and the President.

There are costs when participants adopt a sub-optimizing orientation to joint decision-making. Walton[8] indicates that it leads to a limited exchange of information among the parties and to a distortion of the information exchanged. Sub-optimizing orientation, he says, tends to be accompanied by competitive bargaining. This not only suggests conflict, lack of agreement over operational goals, which occurs in Trustee meetings; but also increases the probability that even if agreement is reached, the compromised solution may have little value to any one institution.

---

[7] David Braybrooke and Charles E. Lindblom, A Strategy of Decision: Policy Evaluation as a Social Process, The Free Press, New York, 1963, pp. 71-74.

[8] Richard E. Walton, "A Theory of Conflict in Lateral Organizational Relationships," in J. R. Lawrence, ed., Operational Research and the Social Sciences, Tavistock Publications, London, 1966, pp. 415, 417.

It is not merely institutional orientation that reigns supreme, but presidential prerogative which is most important. Many Board members say that their function is not to initiate activity but rather to approve what the active committees suggest, that unless programs are initiated from below and have the commitment of the members, they will not be successful. This seems valid, but the institutional presidents do not prod their representatives on the committees, they do not attempt to activate them. Reliance on committee initiative is an insulating device for trustee inaction.

In 1961 the Board reminded the first president that as a matter of policy all new participants to be involved in the Association's activities were to be cleared by the presidents of their respective colleges. In 1968 one Board member desired to substitute his provost for himself at a meeting so as to show a key staff member the potential advantages of the Association. The Board did not allow this temporary transfer. It is "their show," and it will remain under tight control. This control is further maintained through a lack of standing committees for the

Board; except for a very seldomly constituted ad hoc group, all business comes before the entire assembled body. It should be noted that Board turnover has added to a mix of personalities, there being some presidents now who are more committed to the Association than their predecessors were. But financial support is still lacking where moral support is not.

The presidents have a difficult task in separating their responsibilities as Association trustees and institutional leaders, and most often the latter role is played in Association activities and deliberations. Johnson[9] suggests that cooperation is born out of an awareness of limitations. But this is not the shared orientation of the presidents who tend to be egotistical about their operations while in Board meetings. It may be too much to expect organizational leaders to be able to change roles and become community minded when thinking about the Association when during most of the month they actively search for institutional funds, sometimes in competition with other Association members. It is difficult for them to heed Wilson's[10] advice for local demands to be balanced against wider needs.

Not only do the presidents find the role transfer difficult, the Association President does not have the normal advantage of working with a lay board. All of the members, with the exception of the four community representatives, know as much or more about the operation of an educational organization as the President. He cannot shape their opinions, neglect to mention pertinent information, or use the strategies that college presidents have used with their boards of trustees. Because of the members' expertise and internal orientation, they tend both to take too close an interest in the administration of the Association, becoming involved in issues which should be the consortium President's prerogative, and to use the joint spokesman as their administrative aide. This stifles the President and focuses him on short rather than long-range projects.

---

[9] Eldon L. Johnson, "Cooperation in Higher Education," Liberal Education, 48:475.

[10] Logan Wilson, "Form and Function in American Higher Education," The Educational Record, 45:307.

Tension exists among the institutional presidents as well as between them and the consortium administration. The Board meetings are "blunt"; points of view are stoutly defended; and underlying many relatively calm deliberations are personality differences which run below the surface. The minutes of the meetings do not list points made by the various presidents, just the consensus reached. And the word "consensus" is used often to characterize the disposition of an issue. Formal motions are brought up; but the voting pattern, if the issue is not decided by consensus, does not appear.

To say that issues are decided by consensus is not to indicate that there is agreement on issues. When the proposal of contracting with a specific talent recruiter for college personnel came before the Board, there were some presidents who had used this particular service with satisfactory results, but some felt that recruitment was the dean's responsibility, while others believed that the wrong person was being considered for the position. One president felt the others "didn't give a damn" about the quality of their staffs to give the project much attention. Some colleges in the group have contracted with this agency on their own--a serendipitous result from Association involvement.

Another issue pertained to hiring an interior decorator who could advise all the colleges on how to furnish their new buildings. It was defeated. Some colleges did not have the need or the money for such a project, others felt furnishing was such a personal matter that it had to be a decision under the college's control at all times. For the presidents of many small colleges, this means their personal decision. When there is not much difference among a group of semi-competitive institutions, it is the small things, the "different angles" as one president phrased it, that count.

These projects were small and were not initiated. But when there is a coalition of colleges in favor of a project, and it is decided to forge ahead with limited support, hoping to attract the outsiders later, this lack of full commitment jeopardizes the new program. The Association attempted to gain funds from the Ford Foundation for a new library processing center. In reply to a request for support, a Foundation spokesman said, "I am inclined to doubt that we would have much interest in the project unless all were participants....How much will the colleges themselves be contributing to the operational costs of the processing center at the outset, and during each succeeding year"?

There is little opportunity for conflict or lack of agreement: meetings are held infrequently. The Board meets monthly except during the summer; the sessions begin in late morning; there is lunch, and a continuation in the afternoon. There are also periodic two-day weekend sessions which combine the business and social functions. The Association President prepares a report preceding each meeting, which typically includes a listing of proposals submitted and grants solicited; what travelling lecturers appeared at the colleges; the seminars, workshops, meetings, and general activities that occurred, with special emphasis on the larger programs. This report is two to three mimeographed pages in length.

The minutes indicate that the meetings open with remarks by the Chairman of the Board who is elected annually by his colleagues, the secretary's and the treasurer's reports, the President's report on current and proposed activity which calls for responses by the college presidents, and visiting staff who discuss their special concerns such as the Consortium Research Program or the library processing center. As examples of recent items of business, the following are quoted from the minutes:

> Graduate Center: The report on enrollment in the Graduate Center was noted by the Board. Discussion ensued concerning the Graduate Center. It was the consensus that the Trustees be provided copies of the literature describing the Graduate Center. It was also the consensus that further consideration of the Graduate Center would take place after the visit of the State Education Department officials.
>
> Visiting Scholars: It was the consensus that speakers who have appeared already at the various campuses seem to have been well received.

> Nursing: The President reported on discussions with the National League for Nursing. It was the consensus that the Nursing Directors should develop the specifics that would constitute a cooperative program.

In addition to the summary of activities presented monthly, minutes of all committee meetings are mailed to the presidents. Yet, there are gaps in communication. And the presidents do not communicate regularly with the representatives on their campuses about the meetings unless a question about a particular activity is raised.

It should also be noted that the different representatives to committees from any one specific college do not meet as a group on their home campus; and thus, even they do not have a total view of the consortium. The visiting scholar committee member and the nursing director are probably unaware of what each is doing.

The last item of the minutes quoted above refers to a potential program among nursing directors. The only possibility for this program developing is if funds come from outside sources. The colleges on one hand are not willing to increase their general contribution to the consortium's administration, most of which is returned in the form of visiting lecturers and research grants, and on the other hand, do not have vast sums readily available to program new activities. Lack of funds creates tensions within the members, stresses related to the issue of long versus short term programming.

Projects are needed to demonstrate the viability of the consortium to outside grantors. However, initial support is needed from the membership so programs can be developed, but they cost time and money that are "unavailable." The stresses are most apparent when the trustees fund a program that subsequently needs further support. The processing center was many years in the planning, and after a number of consultants, a most active committee that sold the idea on the grounds of the savings that would accrue, it needed greater support than anticipated. Does each college jeopardize its major initial funding or "steal" from its own institutional budgets that are already hard pressed? And how does the president deal with his trustees, business manager, and professors, all of whom will have a voice or complain when the budget is altered? Assuming good will and commitment to a consortium project, considering a large investment that cannot be lost, prior loyalty to the college and shortages of school funds, a great deal of tension is created for the organizational presidents.

Randolph[11] claims that future benefits mean present obligations, and temporal differences make the obligations clearer than the benefits. This, when joined with unmet institutional needs and presidents who are not primarily committed to the consortium, means that there is little forward movement. With regard to commitment, one president said that he gave about ten thoughts a month to the consortium and if the investigator, as a student, could tell him how to obtain more benefits without giving more attention to it, he would be obliged.

In addition to the ever-present difficulty of funding and the institutional situations which prevent large financial, but not moral, commitments, projects are discontinued when they present a threat to the colleges, touching areas that are close to the hearts of the individual institutions. The Association hired a Washington representative to inform the members about legislation that had grant potential. There were personality difficulties; there were problems associated with learning about the needs of nine faculties, questions about paying a representative during two summer months when the faculties were not on campus; but the overwhelming consideration in abandoning the program was that Federal liaison is such an important function that each college felt it should have its own staff member(s) performing it. It is true that college staff members with this responsibility can be more attentive to the needs of their particular college, not only informing faculty of grants available, but helping them write proposals. But many of the objections to the project could have been eliminated by hiring a new person(s) and rewriting the job outline. However, the function is too significant for each institution not to have immediate and total control over it.

---

[11] Lillian Randolph, "A Suggested Model of International Negotiation," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 10:345.

There is fear that the consortium will infringe on internal activities; fear that the Association will become an empire with the benefactor's support; fear that it will grow too large and result in anonymity for the present members, not to mention the uncertainty of new members' attitudes; fear that it might be confused in the public mind with another local institution that has a similar name; and fear that a local major university will attempt to steal its programs. These fears are real to the presidents and point to the insecurity of the institutions and the tensions resulting from their participation in the consortium.

The tension with the consortium was manifested one summer when four new presidents formed a planning group to investigate the organization. The members questioned whether the Association was active enough to merit continued involvement, questions that were interpreted as a personal attack by the consortium President. Recommendations were made, but the investigation was brought to a halt by the more experienced on the Board, and there were few actual changes. To summarize the continued effect these presidential members have had: one left his college, another is committed because of felt donor pressures, and two others have a positive approach to the larger goals, although operational differences remain.

A consultant firm made another investigation that was initiated by outside interests who were contributing large sums to the Center. The report's actual recommendations were dismissed as non-applicable by the institutional presidents: they included linking with a major university, expansion and modification of the graduate program in conjunction with the major university, appointment of a distinguished group of professors, and expansion of a number of programs.

In a resume prepared by the Association, these recommendations are followed by a few paragraphs that appeared in the Report's appendix. In it appears the sentence: "The progress made...has been significant." Not included for general consumption was the prime finding that the Association was at a point (in 1966) where it should increase activities and budget manyfold as a going organization--decisions that were beyond the staff. The programs affect each college "only peripherally":

> The Graduate Center does not serve the member colleges, only a few faculty are involved in the lake program, the Paris studio affects a few faculty, the College English Association is a

> one-day conference, and the visiting scholars contribute flavor but not substance to the campus programs.

The firm said that the activities were too peripheral to warrent continuation of the Association on a current operating budget, exclusive of program and maintenance expenses, of $65,000. Either the program should be enlarged to have substantial effects on faculty and students, or it should be cut back. The staff and members have ignored this significant finding.

It should be noted that the programs were never intended to have a significant effect on faculty and students. With regard to the former, programs have not been devised to create "cosmopolitans" from the many "locals" who are on the faculties, but to keep them from dying intellectually. Many faculty members are middle-aged, going nowhere, and have heavy teaching loads which prevent a research commitment even if a flicker of interest lies in this area. The faculty seminars "tease" the brain and the grants provide some professors with food and rent money for the summer months. With the exception of a periodic student seminar, and a few guest lecturers who appear on campuses, the student bodies reap no benefits from their institution's membership.

There are five lay members of the Board of Trustees; the discussion of their activities is placed at the end of this section because they are minimal.

Each president was asked to invite one lay member from his community to serve on the Board of Trustees. Inasmuch as one of the Association's purposes is to enhance or meet the needs of the "area," the community representatives could interpret these needs to the Board.

Most of the colleges are represented, although one of the trustees acts as a community representative for two colleges and the Central Staff. Some of these individuals participate in the discussions during meetings, and others just observe; but they perform the all-important function of conflict control. The institutional presidents have been less prone to argue vehemently and on tangential issues after these community representatives came on the scene.

It is an honor to be appointed to the Board, and some of the lay members have stopped with that initial accomplishment. Attendance at meetings is irregular and knowledge about basic organizational facts either lacking or inaccurate. Yet some of the lay members do gain from participation. One Board member who is also a trustee at a member college feels participation has broadened her, has shown her the similarity of problems facing institutions of higher education, and has exposed her to new ideas. One lay Board member suggested that more trustees from member colleges should belong: they would provide institutional continuity, given presidential turnover; and they would provide pressure on the presidents for action.

Just as participation broadens and exposes the trustees to new ideas, it has the same functions for the college presidents. After having recounted the tensions and conflicts that are so abundant with the limited commitments that exist, one should wonder if the participants gain any satisfactions beyond the few programs peripherally related to their institutions.

A college president has few people with whom he can communicate in a meaningful way. He cannot talk about his daily problems and concerns with his trustees, and finds few, if anyone on his campus with whom he can share feelings and advice. The Board meetings provide the opportunity for this type of interchange on an informal basis. When one president deals with a student rebellion or recalcitrant faculty member, or troublesome trustee, the other presidents have a ready-made case study. They anticipate how they would deal with similar crises and have the luxury of doing so in a non-threatening atmosphere. In a later section of this paper, the author will discuss the implications of being on an organizational boundary with regard to the issue of cooperation. At this point, however, it should be noted that positional isolation creates the groundwork for participation in an inter-organizational group if the area of discussion does not raise the spector of institutional autonomy and defense. When it comes to dealing with the Students for a Democratic Society, all college presidents, no matter how competitive, are brothers.

Although this is a significant rationale for the presidents' meeting, another that lies unstated, but which is quite real, is oriented toward the future. The state system is threatening the position and viability of the private colleges, and the pressure is increasing yearly. Many of the presidents see the Association as a line of defense. At this point it is not needed, but if meaningful cooperation becomes a necessity for survival, at least the organizational groundwork will have been laid.

THE INDIVIDUAL COLLEGES

At the beginning of this chapter, a statistical outline was presented of each institution in the consortium. There are variations in the number of Ph.D.'s on the faculty, books in the library, and control, but within the broad spectrum of higher education, these colleges are very much alike. The faculty may be more "cosmopolitan" at some of the colleges, but none is research oriented. The chief commitment in these schools is toward teaching, which when voiced is defined as "good teaching." The students enter with much the same "baggage" and are given a liberal arts education.

Most are four-year liberal arts colleges, although there are two two-year institutions, one having a liberal arts-professional orientation, and the other with a traditional community college program. The consortium's literature stresses that the Association is composed of liberal arts institutions. It may neglect mentioning the community college because it is too cumbersome to say "a group of liberal arts colleges and one community college"; but this lapse is related, it seems, to one of the more significant findings of this study--the importance of "prestige" and "image" in a consortium.

Prestige and Image

How does one measure prestige? How does one know the ranking that a specific college has on a prestige scale? The author relied on the perceptions of the people with whom he spoke, but there are some criteria which sensitize the observer--whether the program is essentially liberal arts or professional, the college's age, whether it is private or public, whether two or four year, the age of the buildings: either very old or very new is better than W.P.A. era.

There are, of course, relative rankings within institutions, based on institutional background and function, such as the high ranking of classics in a finishing school or the liberal arts in a community college; but these internal differences usually fade into the background, or call for defensive reactions, when the role occupant is in an inter-collegiate situation.

This section will examine the "prestige" issue as it affects both the institutions and the faculties.

The colleges in the Association exhibit the paradoxical behavior that Homans[12] suggests faces man--to interact with and respect persons in some sense better than himself and a tendency to interact with and like persons similar to himself.

Three of the colleges in the consortium are more prestigious than the others, both in the eyes of members of those institutions and as perceived by the other colleges: Colleges D, E, I. In addition, the two-year institutions and one four-year school are the least prestigious: Colleges B, F, G.

The prestigious institutions exhibit two tendencies: First, either a desire to leave the relationship or reduce interaction with the less prestigious members; and second, an attempt to increase the membership with prestigious colleges in the region who are unaffiliated with the consortium.

---

[12] George C. Homans, Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms, Harcourt, Brace, and World, New York, 1961, p. 334.

The prestige schools gain a number of benefits by being in the Association: they have more power at meetings and can enforce their will, and they gain more hard resources from being members.

The Association has a research grants-in-aid program to provide faculty members with financial assistance so as to be able to spend time on scholarly research. It was designed to be a morale builder, to keep the faculty alive in the classroom, and to enable a professor from a small college, which has trouble obtaining grants, to start a research program. "Equitability" of the awards process will be discussed in a later section, but at this point suffice it to say that over the years the most prestigious institutions have garnered most of the awards. During the period 1962-1964, there were sixty-four grants made, twenty-one of them went to institution D, while there were six other members in the consortium. The least prestigious members at that time, colleges B and F received a total of five. There are a number of factors influencing these totals--size and curriculum of the school, the research orientation of the faculty, the ability of the representative to cull proposals from his faculty and to speak for his institution. However, the most prestigious school garnered most of the grants, by far, during the formative years of the program. The second most prestigious college today, College E, was relocating to a new campus and enlarging its curriculum, and although second in grants received during the 1962-1964 period, was first in 1965 with eight out of twenty-two. College D had only four.

The distribution pattern is becoming equalized, as measured in dollars received, rather than in number of grants approved, during the last few years, although College E is still able to receive more than its fair share. Each institution puts $1,000 into a central fund, which comes from the dues, and matches the grants made to its own faculty. Thus, each school commits itself to a maximum of $2,000 yearly. The 1967 ranking, based on dollars, was as follows:

College E - 5 grants - $2,600
College A - 3 grants - $2,400
College I - 3 grants - $2,067
College F - 5 grants - $2,000
College H - 3 grants - $1,900
College B - 4 grants - $1,900
College C - 4 grants - $1,900
College D - 3 grants - $1,800
College G - 2 grants - $1,750

The differences are not large, but the relative standing of College D has fallen radically. In this regard, officials in that institution are now questioning the whole research grants-in-aid program. They were most anxious to divorce themselves from the consortium, which they would have done had the Association not possessed a research vessel that meshes with a new earth-science program that that college just instituted.

Members of the prestigious colleges repeatedly told the author that they would be more satisfied if they were in a consortium with other prestigious schools. The admissions officer of College D does not wish to start a common admissions program with the other colleges in the consortium because the names appearing on a common application form would not enhance his. He would rather have a joint program with other prestigious schools, even if it meant greater competition for recruits.

In the long-run he would attract better students, and he had an intrinsic desire for "status." In fact, many of the "name" institutions in the consortium do have relationships in certain functional areas with other colleges with whom they wish to identify.

There are, in fact, very few differences among the member schools, and prestige competitiveness is strong only because the gap is so small. If the "prestige" institutions felt secure in their academic standing, the bitter resentment toward the less prestigious institutions would not be as strong as it was found to be. They provide a reminder of what could easily happen.

The less prestigious institutions also achieve benefits from participation, not only in hard resources, but also toward their self-conceptions. It is enhancing to compete with nationally known small colleges and "win" one's share of the resources, even though it be less than a fair share. After all, "what's the difference of a few hundred dollars"?

"Prestige," in fact, is one of the prime reasons behind the continuation of the research program. Each institution gets back essentially what it puts in, but the selection process does not occur in committee. Rather the choices are made at the home institutions by the representatives and, essentially, are ratified at the consortium where bargaining for numbers of grants rather than specific ones takes place. However, the consortium is seen as the referee group by the faculties and this not only relieves the representatives from pressures on their home campuses, it is also more prestigious to receive grants from a supposed impartial agency, and in "competition" with others outside one's college.

As has been indicated, there are different types of benefits for the more or less prestigious institutions in the reward-distribution committee, but when dealing with problem-solving activities, the different standings split rather than bring the groups together.

The English faculties from the prestigious schools do not want to interact with their colleagues in other institutions. Referring to their counterparts in conversation as "the little dears," they have no respect for their scholarship abilities and have no desire to meet in a common setting.

There are, of course, obstacles to faculty interaction, excluding the prestige factor, and they will be dealt with later. However, the investigator was amazed at the unanimity of opinion in the prestigious schools when faculty said they just did not have anything to discuss with their counterparts.

The teaching staffs from the less prestigious institutions also avoid interaction with members of the other schools because they fear ridicule and harbor feelings of subordination which may be based on explicit messages received or beliefs they might be forthcoming.

This insecurity creates one of two reactions: either lack of attendance at meetings and inactive participation at those which are attended, or a defensive reaction that takes the form of boasting. A sad sight is to encounter a competent member of a non-prestigious faculty who twice tells you, and informs others, that he spent the previous year at a major university doing research, or professors who call themselves "doctor"--this urge to cleanse oneself from one's environment.

Once again, the differential among many of the faculty, regardless of institution, is not great. None are research scholars and few are heavily published. They are basically teachers, but then the difference is between, as one faculty member put it, "those who teach 19th Century romantic poetry, and we who teach contemporary drama."

Before describing how the Association unwittingly avoids the "prestige" issue in its programming, and as a result achieves some success, it should be understood that all of the consortium members, prestigious and non-prestigious, exist in the larger environments with institutions whose reputations far outshine theirs. The consortium's distinguished colleges exhibit defensiveness, dissatisfaction, and absenteeism when interacting with the major universities in the area.

One research institution was holding a conference on demography. Its sociology department, which had joined the Association in a National Science Foundation proposal, invited the sociology departments from the member colleges to send representatives, cost-free. However, very few faculty or students from the Association attended. The conference would have been an opportunity for faculty who know little about this burgeoning area in sociology to gain insight into this sub-speciality. But it meant doing it with representatives from institutions with greater reputations and expertise than theirs.

The author realizes the difficulty of implying cause and effect from this one example. There might have been other causes for non-attendance: the feeling that demography is unrelated to their teaching interests or poor timing, to mention but two. However, this example fits a pattern.

The economists from member institutions invited a speaker to discuss an issue before the assembled group. Unlike most speakers programs that are limited to member faculty, the organizer invited colleagues from three nearby research universities. The guest colleagues dominated the evening and brought the discussion to such a high level that many "resident" economists did not understand the dialogue; and the evening is remembered with pain.

When the mathematicians from the member colleges decided between giving papers themselves to their group or inviting outsiders, they opted for the former.

The evidence points to a desire to limit interaction with those who are more competent if one's lower level will be evident in a problem-solving committee or peer group. In a reward situation, different achievements, based on different prestige bases, is functional.

The Association has unwittingly avoided the problem associated with prestige differentials by planning programs designed for neophytes. Everyone lacks knowledge of a field so no one feels inadequate.

The sociologists invite five speakers on role theory, because no one from the member colleges knows much about this specialty. The Association sponsors seminars on different parts of the world--the Middle East, Japan, Africa--with attendance based on interest and lack of knowledge rather than expertise. The neophytes complain bitterly when an expert attends since he usually asks questions that no one understands. In summary, programs designed for beginners or dealing with new areas, and not including experts or outsiders who serve as threats, seem to have the greatest chance of surviving and creating satisfaction for the members.

Gross,[13] in his article, "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach," found that "to increase prestige" was the second most important of forty-seven goals among faculty and administrators at sixty-eight major universities. This variable seems to have relevance to other levels of higher education.

Thompson[14] suggests that prestige striving is striving for power, that organizations emphasize scoring well on criteria that are visible to important task-environment elements, extrinsic criteria when internal measures are unavailable. What is more visable and extrinsic than with whom one associates, and less of a true measure of institutional quality?

Related to the concept of "prestige" is the oft used term "image." Regardless of the prestige of the institution involved, the desire for maintenance of identity limits joint programs and communication. There is a reluctance to have the colleges represent each other. Many admissions officers did not want the Association to have a booth at a personnel convention or a combined office on the West Coast because they do not want their identities mixed.

---

[13] Edward Gross, "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach," American Sociological Review, 33:530.

[14] James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action: Social Science Bases of Administrative Theory, McGraw Hill, New York, 1967, pp. 33, 90-91.

Just as image maintenance prevents cooperation, so programs change the self-images of the colleges involved in a consortium. One of the least prestigious colleges in the Association was pleasantly surprised when it realized that some of its administrative operations were just as or more sophisticated than the most prestigious schools. It might be a fear of reality that works against joint undertakings.

Other Factors

During the course of the case study, the investigator identified organizational factors, in addition to "prestige," that were related to consortium involvement. A discussion of these factors will complete this section.

The institutions, or sub-parts, in the consortium which are forward-looking, those which seem to be asking what they can become rather than those settled into what they are, those that are flexible and innovative, take advantage of and are more active in the Association.

The young chemistry department at a developing college took advantage of adapting a new type of laboratory experience at odds with traditional thinking, after such a project was refused at a major, more conservative university. The consortium funded part of the program. In addition, when the consortium's research coordinators from each institution look at their campuses to identify possible areas for funding, they focus their attention on the growth areas.

One member college decided to develop a new science program and the dynamic provost, whose idea it was, saw advantages in utilizing a research vessel that the Association owned. Quite noticable is the relationship between the dynamic of an institution or department and the ready use it makes of the Association in its plans.

However, an innovative area must, at times, decide not to take advantage of a cooperative program because it is creating jealous enemies on campus. One department that had received a great number of inputs recently, decided not to persuade the president to take advantage of a specific program for fear of faculty reaction to "empire building."

Nevertheless, the oft-quoted phrase by the Central Staff that cooperation is limited by institutional and professional inertia seems to be true.

Different departmental orientations have an effect on interaction. The purposes of "science" in the curricula of different schools in the consortium prevented a decision as to the type of equipment to purchase jointly. One school stresses science for liberal arts students and the other has a more technical approach. Given that each institution has a sufficient quantity of basic equipment, the degree and type of specialization is at issue. A superordinate goal could not be identified.

The intellectual environment at the individual schools also has its effect. If the atmosphere is deadening, so is the relationship to the program, except for the more cosmopolitan faculty there who use the consortium programs for the stimulation that they lack at home.

The climate of academic freedom is of importance for faculty-sharing projects. One faculty member said she would not consider being "on loan" for an extended period to one of the other consortium members because of difficulty it had with the AAUP. This, of course, adds a new dimension to the traditional problems of faculty-sharing which were encountered: deciding on salary when there is a differential between two colleges, increasing the chances of "raiding," and for a teaching campus, taking the professor out of his office and limiting his opportunities for counseling students.

Organizational size seems to be positively related to cooperation. Large colleges have more resources that potentially could be used in the consortium; more is occurring in a larger school thus providing a greater probability of faculty identifying with or creating a program within the cooperative context. The largest colleges came to research grants meetings with more proposals than the smaller schools. One representative felt he received more grants than others because he had some proposals "for emergencies" when the others ran out.

Budgeting procedures at particular colleges may have an indirect effect on the type of representative it sends to the cooperative when the consortium contributes to the member's salary. The income from the consortium to the institution can be placed in the large budget and have no effect on the person chosen as representative, or it can be used to supplement a specific salary. Common sense would indicate a more loyal and dedicated representative to the consortium under this condition. However, two member colleges used the income for paying "marginal people," whom they either had "promoted up" or for whom not enough institutional resources were available.

Observations lead the author to believe that organizations and individuals involved in internal conflict and factional disputes having no relationship to the consortium lead to decreased interaction within the arrangement. One member institution that had a very large number of representatives absent from meetings during the period of the study was going through the turmoil caused by the firing of its president. This institution also resisted a public relations program at that time: they did not want the press on their campus; they were receiving enough bad coverage.

Hermann[15] suggests that organizational crisis decreases organizational integration, leads to withdrawal, a reduction in the number of communications channels, and generally limits the viability of the organization. It also limits the viability of the cooperative in which the organization might hold membership.

A sense of security and its effect on cooperation is also related to the individual members of committees. The public relations people enjoy telling each other that the average tenure for their positions is eighteen months, the committee embarks on few programs; a member who was in a very vulnerable position at home attended few meetings, and was negatively oriented at those he did attend.

Just as consortium programs can stimulate the individual institutions to innovate on their campuses, so if they fail, the results can have severe repercussions.

The non-western seminars held by the consortium did stimulate faculty

---

15. Charles F. Hermann, "Some Consequences of Crisis Which Limit the Viability of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 8:66.

to include such material in the regular courses for students, while another program may have created a more experimental approach to the subject matter.

On the other hand, a joint program which failed could have compromised one institution's external relations. Art work in a consortium program was heavily damaged while in transport from one school. No one has taken responsibility for the incident; one college that operates a gallery feared it would lose the loan service which they frequently use if guilt were thrown on them.

In summary, colleges' prestige and image-maintenance, thrust, purposes, intellectual environment, academic freedom, size, budgeting procedures, internal conflict, and sense of internal security seem to be related to consortium involvement.

PROGRAMMING

PLANNING

The author has discussed the elements leading to cooperation among institutions who place themselves in a specific pattern on the heuristic framework with regard to their consortium involvement. There are two questions that can be raised: why has the consortium produced anything at all, and why has it not accomplished more?

Apologists for consortia claim that cooperation is a slow, often painful process, starting at the periphery of the member organizations and, given initial successes, working its way toward the center. This seems to have some, but not great applicability with regard to the Association: there are a few more programs this year than in previous years, but it is questionable whether, with the exception of the library processing center, the slightly increased activity has been matched by a greater depth.

The Association currently sponsors these programs, with the costs estimated for the 1968-69 academic year: a conference for secondary school guidance counselors ($7,000); non-western studies seminars ($10,000 and partially state supported); four academic discipline seminars ($9,000); a College English Association one-day conference ($1,000); Foreign Area Materials Center--a contract with the state for the production of visual aids ($500); committee meetings and workshops ($2,500); visiting scholars ($20,000); Research Grants ($9,000); and a student seminar ($1,000). The total is $60,000. In addition, there are projects financed by grants: the Consortium Research Development Program ($42,500); the Graduate Center supported by a local industry ($150,000), and an aquatics summer program with NSF support ($10,500). There is also the library processing center which orders and processes books for some of the member colleges.

It is only when one realizes that most of these projects were functioning in 1965 or earlier, matches them with the continuous refusals of committees to initiate new programs, realizes the excruciating work demanded of the Central Staff in initiating programs that do succeed, and understands that these programs, plus whatever benefits come from very periodic meetings and workshops, are the products of 25 standing committees consisting of 246 people over an 8 year period, can one understand that the journey has not proceeded very far.

There is a great deal of literature indicating the prerequisites of a productive joint encounter. In brief, it consists of external pressures and internal needs, and these to be linked with a perceptual unity in the group. Deutsch[16] refers to this as psychological simultaneity, Mead[17] as inter-subjectivity or interpenetration of perspectives, Schelling[18] as tacit coordination. Sherif[19] suggests that "the basic condition for a larger sense of 'weness' not torn by divided and contradictory loyalties, is the recognition of a common predicament leading to transactions to do something about it." To this, he adds the necessity of a superordinate goal to increase the distinctiveness of the problem for the involved group. Blake and Mouton[20] feel that "cooperation is an alternative to competition only when there is a shared internal motivation to solve both common and distinctive problems, while respecting the maintenance of legitimate group boundaries."

Representatives from member colleges to the Association use expressions similar to those above. Coordination said one was a response to a major problem, a "mass," and the subsequent focusing on it by the involved committee.

---

[16] Morton Deutsch, "The Effect of Motivational Orientation Upon Trust and Suspicion," Human Relations, 13:127.

[17] George H. Mead, Mind, Self, and Society, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1934, p. 298.

[18] Thomas C. Schelling, The Strategy of Conflict, Oxford University Press, New York, 1960, p. 90.

[19] Musafer Sherif, Group Conflict and Co-operation: Their Social Psychology, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1966, pp. 173, 88.

[20] Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, "The Intergroup Dynamics of Win-Lose Conflict and Problem-Solving Collaboration in Union-Management Relations," in M. Sherif, ed., Intergroup Relations and Leadership: Approaches and Research in Industrial, Ethnic, Cultural, and Political Areas, John Wiley, New York, 1962, pp. 94-140.

The librarians have had a long history of cooperation within the Association. Facing rapidly rising costs for books and equipment, and the difficulty of recruiting qualified librarians to the rural areas, plus a library science that is changing radically, with automation and information retrieval in the near future, the conditions for establishing a library processing center were present. The perceptual unity of the service-oriented librarians was attested to by the consultants the committee engaged, who themselves added a note of objectivity to the need. Said the first of these:

> Were (the Association), its parent organization, cease to exist tomorrow, these librarians would want to continue to work together. They are dedicated to the proposition that each must help his institution to develop as strong a library on the campus as is possible, and the one way in which to do this is to work together to achieve common goals....While the individuals are, in general, universally good, it is in the group that one becomes especially aware of how much they add to each other. Their will to work together also contributes to their group strength.

There is no committee with as much to show from cooperation. It has prodded the consortium President and the institutional presidents into establishing a common library processing center. The librarians send their book orders to this facility which submits the requests to the publishers. The central unit then receives the volumes, stamps them, inserts each library's cards, supplies card catalog material, sends the books to the members and monthly bills to the business managers. This highly automated facility also produces a number of "exotic" resources such as a union list of acquisitions, and other outputs highly useful to librarians and their clients.

Most of the other committees are non-functional, except for a few meetings a year which are either social in nature, or at which a speaker discusses some technique, such as new accounting procedures, which are not applied on the home campuses. For this reason, the Central Staff does a great deal of planning on its own. There are two consequences to this random and usually futile activity: depth is sacrificed for breadth, and means precede ends.

The Association President, coming into office at a low point in the organization's viability, made the choice of emphasizing a larger number of projects for depth on a few. He went to different committees and individuals trying to ignite as many fires as possible in order to keep the organization working. As a consequence, the committees sponsored a limited number of small programs which had no developmental value, such as a conference for two-year institutions and a workshop with medical school admissions directors. The Association President, among others, feels that possibly a long-range project with great potential for the colleges would have been more valuable for future growth. It would have attracted money and would have had a growing impact, at least a significant one, in one area of the colleges.

The lake program has this potential. The Association was given a research vessel, a very expensive and uncommon piece of equipment. Located on a deep fresh-water lake and on immediate call to faculty, it provides a unique opportunity for making science curricula pertinent to contemporary problems, such as pollution; to study the recreational, sociological, and psychological problem associated with the aquatic environment; and to attract oceanographers, which it has already accomplished. Because of demand, faculty at major oceanography centers have to wait weeks to board vessels to do their research. There is no wait here.

A summer limnology course has been offered, and the member colleges and outside institutions are utilizing the facilities with greater and greater frequency. Had this project been given prime attention, and there is still the potential for it to happen, the shape of the Association would have been quite different. It might then have the resources to affect change and sponsor other services for its members. However, it should be remembered that when dealing with small liberal arts colleges, with an ideal of a well-rounded program, selective emphasis in one field by a consortium might help to destroy such symmetry. Also, subspecialization might be more appropriate to a graduate setting as compared to the different function of an undergraduate institution.

The lake program is an example of another aspect of central planning: means precede ends. The boat was a gift and it necessitated a series of meetings to decide what to do with it.

Because of the "pot-shots" that the staff takes at foundation and governments, the Association's future is more dependent on what outside agencies want than what the consortium might decide if it had the opportunity. The Association's records contain numerous references to trips and meetings for the purpose of sounding out a potential program. At times, faculty or administration from the member colleges are involved in the initial effort, but the President also goes outside privately and then attempts to bring in participants from the member schools. In any respect, outside funding, rather than rational short or long-range planning rules. Although the analogy is crude, one is reminded of an animal desperately attempting to find its way through a maze to the cheese.

There is one other consequence to central planning, whether it is accomplished by the staff and/or the committees: it increases the likelihood of not meeting the specific needs on any one campus. The consortium development program committee designed a seminar series whereby consultants would visit the member colleges to advise on new trends in higher education. One consultant was not prepared to talk about the issues facing some of the campuses; and the faculties, not knowing what the consultant's strengths were, were not prepared to utilize his services. When one staff member makes arrangements for all colleges, there is a greater possibility for the individual school's specific needs to suffer, even if by oversight.

The consortium research development committee decided after their first year of experience to abandon the difficult task of determining what the colleges' desires were as a group, and gambling that one person or group would satisfy the combined needs. Now each member college is given one-ninth of the money for workshops, and it decides what it wants within the broad framework established by the grant. The Central Staff now only makes the contacts and the arrangements for the visits. Said the staff member responsible for this committee:

> We felt that our goals might be realized more effectively if each institution were to determine for itself a major area of concentration in which it would

> have a greater voice in planning programs. The area of concentration selected would be an area which has the greatest potential for development on that campus.

The author suggests that this example has important implications for the prevention and resolution of conflict as well as meeting individual needs: decrease the interaction for planning. The consortium, as an association of colleges, will still be able to attract grants.

Program planners must take into consideration the developmental level of precedents, current offerings, and the expectations of the individual campuses when deciding on new projects. There are some colleges in the Association who, before membership, had virtually no lecture series and were pleased with the new opportunity for such programs. On the other hand, some of the institutions already had the resources for such series and had good programs in progress. These colleges wanted something different: visiting scholars who would remain on campus for an extended period of time. The same considerations were applicable to joint library purchasing: some developing colleges were adding immense numbers of books to their libraries, while the institutions not undergoing expansion had less need for a joint service.

The developmental level of the planning committee is also a consideration. A science faculty member said that he at one time had been full of exciting ideas for sharing research equipment, but gave up such ideas because of a low interest by others. A member of an administrative committee made a number of suggestions which "fell on deaf ears." He thought his colleagues were uninterested in raising the level of programming but later discovered that similar ideas had been presented before by some of the current members. Because the suggestions had not been acted upon previously, the meetings were rituals.

This section on planning has dealt with the importance of reaching a "critical mass," the alternative between broad or depth programming, the problem of means determining goals, and the need to consider the developmental level of the member institutions. There are other factors that have a bearing on the planning process.

First, it seems that programs with more immediate feed-back are planned. Long-range plans are not made because of the limited interest and resources of the members. Because programs and meetings are planned with a short-range perspective, institutional budgets which are made on a yearly basis do not mesh with the short-term activities of the Association. For instance, one member college did not have enough travel funds for representatives to attend meetings because of a failure to take this expense into account.

However, one advantage to short-term efforts is that they coincide with the limited time the faculty and administration have for any joint project. Many of those interviewed said they administered a program only because it was of limited duration, and they would be ready for another such responsibility in two years.

Coupled with immediate feedback is the desire for programs which are visable. The admissions officers host a group of counselors who travel to each of the colleges; the librarians were able to obtain a processing center. It is difficult, if not impossible, to measure the intrinsic value of programs, such as workshops; it is easier to know how many speakers have appeared on the campus. Guest speakers also provide legitimatization. When professors from Chicago, Columbia, and Cornell spend three hours on campus, it at least "looks good."

The member colleges are small schools with powerful presidents, and it was "grants to" rather than "advice from" that initially comprised the interaction between the faculty and the administrators. The consortium has only recently emphasized faculty participation. Most of the committees are composed of administrators, and most of the faculty groups are composed of departmental chairmen. The regular faculty are not primarily involved. It seems to the author that general faculty support, which is noticeably lacking, is the result of initial inattention. Many of the faculty who are involved in planning are interested in the consortium, and do think about using it for their own interests.

But faculty involvement does have a drawback. Professors not only produce an abundance of ideas which lack focus, but some use the opportunity of a joint meeting to exhibit their powers of independent thinking.

There are, of course, some other difficulties: vested interests insure that program areas already functional in member colleges will be difficult to shift into a consortium composed of equals, and there is no guarantee that it will be more successful in the new context. If schools are in fact equal with regard to faculty quality, there is little reason to share this resource; programs that involve the sharing of hardware should insure local inputs of geographical proximity; and there must be agreement on means as well as goals. The colleges need new sources of recruits: for some, joint recruiting on the West Coast implies "cosmopolitanism," for others the East Coast would present a challenge to their quota systems.

"Planning" is closely related to the role behaviors of consortium representatives. It is this aspect of the programming process--determining who is most likely to become involved in joint decision-making and how representatives interact in this setting--which is now examined.

ROLE BEHAVIOR

When people change to new positions they carry over perceptions and attitudes from the old role behavior: earlier experiences provide the frame of reference for adapting to new role expectations. Jacobsen's[21] observation has a great deal of significance for behavior in the consortium. The author will examine the implications of this statement by suggesting how an individual's position in his organization and in the administrative hierarchy influences behavior in an inter-institutional setting.

There is both positive and negative transfer of attitudes and behavioral patterns from the individual organizations to the consortium.

---

21. Eugene Jacobson, et. al., "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations," The Journal of Social Issues, 7:25.

Bass[22] defines the former as a facilitator of performance whereby new circumstances call for behavior similar to older situations. The latter occurs when the new is different from the old, requiring new modes of behavior, but responded to by old patterns of action. It is detrimental to performance.

It has been indicated that the institutional presidents find it difficult to act the "trustee" role. In addition, many of the admissions, public relations, and development officers are affected by role-transfer dynamics. The stock-in-trade for these individuals is the image of their respective colleges. Thus, there is a press against any type of cooperative activity whereby the clarity of their organizations is in any way potentially compromised. The admissions officers do have a successful program, but each college is visited and hosts the counselor group in its own manner. A common admissions form or combined recruitment scheme might tend, so some believe, to cloud over unique individual differences. Obviously, this feeling would not exist if the environmental constraints were such that "image" would survive at the expense of institutional survival.

The objections to the Association's operation are based at times upon the task expectation of individuals in their colleges. The development officers at some of the colleges complain about the "lack of explicit guidelines," the open-ended nature of the consortium. What other group would be so concerned with guidelines and explicitness?

There are disagreements within the institutions about the value of

---

22. Bernard Bass, Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1960, p. 182.

consortium programs, and as one would expect, the "antagonists" base their arguments on advantages accruing to their operations. The business officer at one college fought for membership in the library processing center because it would enable him to write a monthly check for all purchases rather than spend, at times, more money for check processing than book cost. The librarian had objections based upon the amount of work and cost involved in changing from a Dewey Decimal to Library of Congress classification system, which is a pre-requisite for using automated machinery.

There are great objections to the inclusion of a person in a consortium project which requires the use of technical hardware. There is the observation by peers that a good theoretical understanding of the discipline is unrelated to facility in using the equipment. There is no challenge to intellectual but to manipulative competencies.

There also might be a transfer of attitudes with regard to faculty meetings. There is a great deal of resistance on the part of the English faculty to assembling, discussing topics, and reading papers. Such activity is much more common in the natural and social sciences than in English where feelings of independence, possibly resulting from a lack of paradigm orientation, is evident. The sciences meet a great deal more often, and enjoy interaction more than their "humanist" counterparts.

Finally, a healthy dynamic is created when role complementarity exists between task behavior in both the consortium and the college. There are three committees, outside the functional areas, where this could exist: the two research granting groups and the visiting scholar committee. The representative could be on these committees and also be on the college's research council or lecture planning group, and it is to the colleges' and the consortium's mutual benefit if this is so. The research people would deal with the total institutional requests, assigning proposals to that funding area that is most promising, and taking advantage of all the resources. The members on the lecture series group could and do use the college program to fill gaps in the consortium series, or try to fund the most costly lectures through the Association.

One of the most frequently heard comments during the field work was that the presidents speak for and defend their institutions, that they are most concerned about organizational autonomy. What else, ask some, can you expect from a college president? The presidents are the least interested in initiating projects on their own and use the excuse that the proposals should come from below. This statement is slightly paradoxical given the oft used authoritarian behavior on many of the campuses. One president who desires initiative from below is the same who during one period personally ordered every book his library purchased.

The college staffs do become involved periodically in new programs. And according to the literature this should be so. For instance, Porter[23] suggests that cooperation, adaptability, caution, agreeability, and tactfulness are more apt to be associated with and more important to staff position functioning and that forcefulness, imagination, independence, self-confidence, and decisiveness are related to line positions. Zajonc and Wolfe[24] found that staff employees have wider communication contacts than line employees. Staff, according to these writers, should have more tools to work in an inter-organizational setting: they know their organization and are able to compromise and adapt to situations as they occur. The author believes that a "service" orientation is an additional important consideration.

---

[23] Lyman W. Porter, Organizational Patterns of Managerial Job Attitudes, American Foundation for Management Research, 1964, p. 42.

Within the staff are some individuals who, unlike financial aids or admissions officers perform "service" roles: a director of research whose responsibility is to know his faculty's needs and stimulate proposals, an assistant dean of a college, and an assistant to the president of a member institution. All three were most active on one committee and were active in their home institutions attempting to utilize the consortium's potential, and each had a responsibility to facilitate action on his home campus.

The author suggests, however, that "service" orientation is but half of the pre-requisite: the other is to be high enough in the organization to have an overview of total institutional needs, to possess both functional and strategic information,[25] and to have authority in urging colleagues to work on consortium programs.

---

[24] Robert B. Zajonc and Donald M. Wolfe, "Cognitive Consequences of a Persons's Position in a Formal Organization," Human Relations, 19: 148.

[25] Morris Janowitz and William Delany, "The Bureaucrat and the Public: A Study of Informational Perspectives," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:146-147.

It has been indicated that staff officers with service orientations who are relatively high in the colleges' hierarchies seem to be more active in and have greater potential to use the Association. There seems to be another structural condition, somewhat paradoxical to the former, that has a similar effect: boundary or external orientation.

Kahn et. al.[26] find that occupants of organizational boundary positions, those who face outward, are subject to a great deal of stress because of widely varying expectations of role performance; they usually lack authority, and rely on power derived from friendship, respect, and trust. In addition, the authors find that boundary position occupants are more innovative than those who have an internal orientation because of exposure to changing external requirements. Dubin[27] suggests that innovators are minimally committed to their organizations and have maximum access to the environment. Woodward[28] believes that isolated supervisors are more independent and turn to their colleagues rather than their supervisors for help and advice. Kerr and Siegel[29] find that isolation is related to the strength of group formation in union activities.

In summary, the literature suggests that boundary positions are related to roll stress, isolation, cooperation among peers, and innovation as a result of environmental constraints.

---

[26] Robert L. Kahn et. al., Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity, John Wiley, New York, 1964, Chapter 6.

[27] Robert Dubin, "Stability in Human Organizations," in Mason Haire, ed., Modern Organizational Theory, John Wiley, New York, 1959, pp. 246-247.

[28] Joan Woodward, Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice, Oxford University Press, London, 1964, pp. 120-121.

[29] Clark Kerr and A. Siegel, "The Inter-Industry Propensity to Strike--An International Comparison," in A. Kornhauser, et. al., eds., Industrial Conflict, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1954, pp. 189-212.

Of the over twenty "problem-solving" committees in the Association, five consist of boundary personnel, and three of these have outputs which are among the most successful the consortium has produced.

The institutional presidents are isolated and externally oriented and have fruitful, informal, problem-solving discussions; the externally oriented admissions officers interact to sponsor successful counselor visitation programs.

The librarians are in "limbo." They are housed in buildings separate from other role positions, are neither faculty nor staff, but in many respects both, and have to struggle with the administration for more funds and with the faculty over better service. They are in a rapidly changing, problematic, technical situation, faced with rising costs, and what with a professional ethic of "service," have joined together for fruitful discussions and a very active new project orientation.

All three groups are composed of boundary personnel, are relatively isolated, and respond to problems through cooperation.

However, isolation is not in itself a condition for cooperation: an external orientation and some degree of social support must exist. Some Association representatives were isolated by being ignored or not being supported by their colleagues. They did not suffer from too many expectations, but too few; and they did not desire to participate in the consortium program: "Why help the college when it does not care about me."

Consortium involvement may also affect the power of the role occupant.

When new arrangements are made or programs established in academic areas that rest on other than disciplinary grounds, then the administrators, rather than the faculty, have a great amount of power vis-a-vis these programs. Thus, it seems, on the whole, consortia strengthen the powers of the administration.

Traditionally, college presidents have been able to control faculty by emphasizing and judging teaching. The Association presidents on the Board of Trustees can now affect an academic function that has been traditionally beyond their power to control, except in a negative way by preventing it: research.

Many members of the research committee indicate that they and top administrative officers judge faculty requests on the basis of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Two of the latter are whether the faculty member is "liked" and if the college wants to keep him.

Also, the Association's Board has to approve the committee selection of faculty who receive grants. The Board has never reversed a committee decision...but it could, and legally. Inasmuch as the small grants may be precursors of applications to national funding sources, this gives college presidents a great deal of potential control over the research function.

Faculty and middle administrations may also gain power through the

Association. Michel Crozier[31] initially suggested the viable proposition that power accrues to persons who deal with areas of uncertainty. With this idea, Thompson created the propositions that "the inducement/contributions negotiations process rests on the individual's reputation for scarce abilities to solve organizational-rationality problems."[32] In addition, "the more sources of uncertainty or contingency for the organization, the more bases there are for power and the larger the number of potential political positions."[33]

Given peripheral involvement and need for Association on the part of the colleges, one would posit few major power positions resulting from personal involvement by the representatives. However, some individuals do extend their influence and/or power. One representative is a member of many Association committees, and is said by her colleagues to enjoy the role of "big fish in a little pond." Another representative on the research council enjoys his ability to juggle fund requests and reduce those which he feels are "unreasonable." For instance, he reduced a summer stipend from $1,200 to $800 because this is what he felt a faculty member could live on. He agreed to an expenditure for a typewriter with the explicit understanding that he would receive it after the research was terminated.

There are a number of traits that individuals either possess, or attitudes they perceive, or prior experiences that influence their role behavior in consortia.

---

[31] Michel Crozier, The Bureaucratic Phenomenon, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1967, p. 192.

[32] James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

[33] *Ibid.*, p. 129.

A large number of individuals interviewed had experienced consortium involvement while on the staffs of other institutions. And the prior experiences did shape attitudes toward the Association. Persons who had previous satisfactory involvement showed some perception of the Association's difficulties, based on experience, and suggested new programs to the Staff. Favorable previous experience, however, did not guarantee a responsive stance to the Association: it at times reinforced nonparticipation by emphasizing the differences between the two groups.

It was indicated earlier that individuals who were insecure on their home campuses tend not to become involved and the "forward-looking" see an opportunity for benefits. Grossack[34] suggests that an individual's frame of reference will determine his expectations of others. And many of those interviewed expect their colleagues to react to the Association as they did. Self-conception, in a more private sense, is also related to involvement: one faculty member sees himself as an experimenter and perceives an opportunity to play this part in a receptive organization.

Antagonisms may result when different styles are represented on one group. Some admissions officers believe in the "hard sell," others the "soft sell," some are "generous" hosts and others more "niggardly." Being in limited competition with each other, they seemingly look for differences upon which to comment.

The sex of the institutional representative may have an influence on the dynamics. One female faculty member in charge of a project interprets negative reactions as based on her sex. By feeling a "top sergeant" is needed in the project, she might over-react to the sex difference, and in doing so, create conflict for a different reason. Another female with an admitted unnatural feeling as the only woman in a committee composed of males, and a need for male support, compromised her institution's position by bargaining away her "fair share," to the anger of her institutional president.

---

[34] Martin M. Grossack, "Some Effects of Cooperation and Competition Upon Small Group Behavior," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49:347.

3

Dearborn and Simon[35] indicate that executives perceive those aspects of a situation that relate specifically to the goals and activities of their departments. Some faculty members see potential for their projects--one tries to begin a mathematics seminar, another attempts to form an Asian Institute. However, these faculty who have an interdisciplinary orientation, who perceive any input from any source, as having a positive effect on their teaching, seem to be more in favor of and take greater advantage of the Association's programming. This eclectic and wide-scope orientation also results from an intense interest in matters outside the teaching function--for personal fulfillment. This might be a substitute for a research-oriented cosmopolitan role. Some cosmopolitans do frequent the Association, for research grants, programs designed for their particular needs, or to escape the boredom of their campuses.

---

35. Dewitt C. Dearborn and Herbert A. Simon, "Selective Perceptions: A Note on the Departmental Identifications of Executives," Sociometry, 21:140.

In the last two sections of this chapter, the author has examined the planning process and the role behavior of those who are involved in these activities.

Much of the interaction for planning occurs in committee meetings.

COMMITTEES AND MEETINGS

Twenty-four committees that compose the "grass-roots" level of the organization are supposed to initiate new program ideas and send them for approval to the Board of Trustees. How are these committee members chosen?

The college presidents, who may delegate the task to the academic dean, choose members for the Association's committees. Of course, for most groups, the "choice" is the person who holds a functional position within the institution, such as the business manager, development officer, or department head. However, the president is not so restricted in naming members to nine of the committees, such as the research council, arts committee, or international education group. Where options exist, there is, of course a trend to name people who have some expertise in the areas. But this does not hold for such groups as the consortium research committee where only three members are more sophisticated research-oriented psychologists.

At times the choices are very self-serving. One college department which had a member on the research council, that voted on faculty grants, was able to maintain its hold in this area although there was a change in actual representation. Although members of this department did receive research grants the following year, the import of this captured area is in the relative power position such membership means on the campus.

On the other hand, one dean used a variety of criteria which considered benefits for the institution, the individual, and the committee. She selected a "personable, articulate" representative who was in the social sciences to off-set the heavy natural science composition in the committee, and who being in his first year at the college would have the time, due to a reduced course load, and a desire to become acquainted with the area colleges.

Many of the committee representatives do not know they have been appointed or even that a particular committee exists. There are some groups that exist on paper only. There are also a large number of people who said they met as a group with colleagues but that it would be incorrect to call it a "committee" with what that term implies.

Meetings are called either by the chairman, if there is one, the Central Staff, or they are on a particular monthly schedule. And each "call" is accompanied by a return post card enabling the members to list available times. Changes are frequent after the initial times are set.

At times the Central Staff has potential projects that it wants to discuss with different groups, such as an NDEA loan collection service with financial aids officers, or the possibility of a systems study of college administration with the business managers. The committees meet, but the initiative coming from another source usually indicates that everyone will listen to the idea, schedule another meeting two months from that date, and come with various objections to the proposals. Below are minutes from two meetings which capture the spirit of the groups.

The first meeting was called by the Central Staff to discuss a particular project and the second featured a guest speaker who was suggested by one of the committee members who could not attend the session because of important considerations on his campus.

The Student Financial Aid officers met December 14, 1967.

a. The group discussed the organizational status of the financial aid officers at the various colleges and systems of communication with other college officers. Information was exchanged on the Work-Study Program, Economic Opportunities Grants, and the National Defense Education Act. The consensus of the group was that each financial aid officer forward nine copies of an award letter to the Association for distribution to the other member colleges.

b. The President informed the group of the existence of a foundation which makes direct loans to students.

c. Considerable discussion ensued concerning recruitment efforts for disadvantaged students. It was the consensus that the admissions officers be made aware of the need for recruiting disadvantaged students.

d. Consideration was also given to a NDEA Loan Collection program. Presently there are about 3,500 outstanding loans to former students of member colleges. The President indicated that he would discuss this with the business officers and trustees of the Association. (This program received a great deal of staff effort, but did not catch the interest of the colleges.)

e. It was the consensus that another meeting of the financial aid officers should be scheduled for late January and in February.

Meeting of Business Managers, January 18, 1968

a. One representative made an article available that gave information and costs concerning his use of plastic wrapping for mailing catalogs.

b. A representative outlined application of a plastic laminated card for libraries, and ID which could be used in a computer system. A photo studio has made proposals to the member for producing the cards.

c. The guest discussed unit costs and questions involved in their use. He also made available samples of reports that could aid in the study of costs.

d. It was the consensus of the group that the next meeting be scheduled for March 27. Subject will be employment practices and administrative personnel handbooks.

There were a variety of motivations to attend these and other meetings. Committee members report the following: a sense of obligation to gain something from the relationship, because it is contributing to your salary, because one's chairman wants you to attend, fear that the committee will decide something which will have an impact on one's operation, to prevent having to extricate yourself from decisions already made,and an opportunity to boast. The colleges are semi-competitive and want to "look good" in each other's eyes. Whether it comes from the president who instructs his representative to "show them we're alive," or from a zealous committee member who discusses what is going on in his college, or passes out literature that received an award for design, this element seems to be quite strong.

The meetings have an important social function for some administrators. The librarians are "good friends" and enjoy talking about common problems, not only for the extrinsic reasons, to put the information to use, but because they just enjoy being together.

The sharing of information is quite important, not as a motivation to attend, but it is what usually transpires. It is not known if this information has any use. The administrators say that maybe something discussed will be topical for them three or four years later.

Program planning and decision-making do not occur often. The meetings are irregular, the representatives usually do not or cannot commit their colleges, and this leads to slow, if any, forward movement.

Most committees meet with seven or eight in attendance only three or four times a year or less. Some groups have not met since 1964. The consortium staff is aware of the limited amount of work that a group meeting 15 hours a year can accomplish. But they feel that regularly scheduled meetings would lead to poor attendance by a majority of members and thus the establishment of an elite attitude by those who did attend. Thus, they consciously substitute larger attendance for "equality," and more frequent and possibly more meaningful sessions for lack of depth.

The staff also feels that one failure may destroy a segment of the overall program; risks are not taken because of the insecurity.

There are some committees that have explicit functions: they have to decide on visiting scholars or distribute research funds. These committees meet two or three times a year, essentially in long sessions to accomplish their tasks. These are "technical meetings"; policy is very seldom discussed, and when it is, conflict, at times, erupts. The admissions officers meet to "work out" the logistics of the visiting counselors, but when a proposal was made by one member for a common application form, "each person looked at each other with implicit comparisons in their minds." The proposer wished he had not brought up the topic. In general, the members are satisfied with the level of accomplishment and cannot afford the time and do not want to spend energies on revision. Some members said that there is no attention paid to policy and there is not much conflict because no one really cares enough.

In general, the functional committees do not correspond to the needs of the members as they see them. What value, they ask, is there to having one financial aid or admissions form when I devised one specifically for my student body and philosophy of operation. There is a committee that discusses the lake program, but at a recent meeting, the members had such divergent interests that the group split: one segment talked about funding a summer program and the other, which had money, discussed the difficulty of and solutions for getting a boat captain. The needs of the groups were different, although they were in the same program; energies could not be "massed" on one problem.

The last problem points to one of the most pervasive problems facing the Association: the difficulty of communication.

There are communication gaps between the colleges and the Association, prompting one staff member to suggest the need for a "circuit rider"; but gaps also exist between committee representatives on any one campus and among the committees.

There are no combined meetings of institutional representatives, resulting in a lack of positive communication as well as conflict when one representative takes action that has a bearing on another's operation. The business managers, for instance, were unaware of some expenditures decided upon by other representatives; a new committee member was not oriented by his predecessor to the dynamics of the group and as a consequence did poorly in obtaining research funds. The librarians "sold" the processing center to the presidents with the idea that it would provide better service to library users, as well as save money. The presidents heard the latter justification and are being disappointed.

There is also a lack of contact among committees. However, communications from the functioning groups to the Board are "built in" as a consequence of the need for approval for new programs. Usually the feedback is negative: a project is not approved because it costs money and suggestions for the revamping of programs meets with resistance. The Board demanded explanations for the methods used to approve research grants and entertained ideas for a revised lecture series. But no action followed because of the sensitivity of both areas. There is a thrust to avoid policy discussions which might result in conflict and compromise the few gains the members receive from involvement.

A number of observations were made that have implications of the functioning of the committees.

Very few administrative committees have permanent chairman. Most of the faculty committees have "titular" heads, but at times, the chairmanship rotates to the person on whose campus the program is held. No one and everyone feels responsible for calling a meeting and for the progress of a committee. Formal authority among members of a cooperative is difficult to initiate or maintain. But initiation of activities from or with the membership and not the Central Staff is needed to insure greater relevance and give professional legitimacy to the sessions.

The prestige differentials that were mentioned earlier play an important role in committee meetings. Whether it be between the "liberal arts faculty" and the "educators" or "large" and "small" colleges, division based on various perceptions of difference are made and have a significant effect on committee interaction.

The consortium furnishes each CORD representative with $2,500 to stimulate research on his campus. For this the colleges are supposed to relieve this faculty member from one-quarter teaching or administrative responsibility, which few do. One representative reports that those who are given the "added" responsibility do a great deal of complaining in committee meetings, and are most concerned about prestige, frequently adding the number of grants they have received. They become more aggressive when they feel they are being taken advantage of by their institutions.

Perception of conflict, however, seems to be related to whether a member represents a constituency on his campus or whether he is a relatively free agent which few are. The members who can compromise easily and are not bound by their peers, as for instance in the selection of visiting speakers, see little conflict in committee meetings. Those representing a faculty committee or student union board perceive the situation as both a waste of time and an "intellectual rape." They attempt to meet institutional needs, but by the very nature of the committee decision, are compromised. One college did without speakers, although they were paid for in advance, because its emphasis was not represented in the final consortium choices.

Many representatives have their institutions "do without" because they are on the edge of retirement and do not want to engage in long-term commitments. This is especially pertinent with regard to some members of the Board of Trustees: presidents who foresaw leadership changes in the near future.

There is turnover on the committees, especially those not representing functional areas of the member institutions. This coupled with few meetings, means that strangers usually meet. One representative said it is hard to be cohesive when you need a formal introduction every time you see each other.

Schelling[36] suggests that in a pure collaboration game, players must understand each other, discover patterns of individual behavior that makes players' actions predictable, and communicate by hint and suggestion. On one faculty committee with members from a variety of disciplines, the most active were three psychologists. They controlled the discussion and were members of the summer planning group. It could have been their research orientation, since the committee had that purpose, but it may have been their feeling of commonality. The visiting scholar committee is composed of faculty and one student personnel administrator who feels removed both intellectually and emotionally from her colleagues. A Central Staff member is conscious of his lack of academic preparation when interacting with faculty from the member colleges. Thus, common educational background may create a bond upon which further interaction will develop. According to Scheff,[37] with little or no communication, coordination is a function of consensus.

The author observed Clark's[38] finding that decision-making takes a great deal longer in an inter-organizational setting than it does if only one organization is involved. The visiting scholar committee decision takes months to coordinate; in fact, one potential lecturer

---

36. Thomas C. Schelling, op. cit., pp. 84-85.

37. Thomas J. Scheff, "A Theory of Social Coordination Applicable to Mixed-Motive Games," Sociometry, 30:226.

38. Burton R. Clark, "Interorganizational Patterns in Education," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10:236.

withdrew his name from consideration because of the inordinate amount of time the decision took. A staff member could not write a proposal in three weeks because consultation and agreement among the nine colleges would have been improbable during that period.

The Association is a formal organization, while the committees are informal in nature: they do not own property or have legal sanctions. Yet when members of these informal groups do decide on programs, they may acquire property and sign contracts, and confusion and conflict may result. Does the chairman of a project have the authority to prevent or make purchases? Legal authority and responsibility, resulting from signing a foundation grant, does not mesh with information leadership when the committee assumes the chairman to be operating under the latter charge.

FUNCTIONS

REWARDS

A basic assumption of this study is that individuals cooperate for benefits, whether hard or symbolic, and that continuation in an inter-institutional relationship is dependent upon a favorable reward-cost ratio. It has been indicated that the Association members entered the cooperative especially for potential gains and were satisfied that present reward be low as long as the costs were minimal. The investigator will now examine how "rewards" are related to individual, committee, and organizational behavior.

Individual

Grusky[39] suggests "the greater the rewards an individual has received or expects to receive, the greater his commitment to the system." This finding is of supreme importance in understanding the motivation of the faculty who participate actively on committees. Administrators do not receive hard resources--grant money for participation--and this may explain why they are inactive.

There are two grants committees. The first is the Research Council which distributes approximately $20,000 to resident faculty each year to pursue whatever projects they desire, and the second is the CORD committee which has $4,000 (1969) for educational research. There are a number of guidelines for the administration of each type of grant. Essentially, they are for summer support.

There are well over eight hundred faculty members who have access to these funds. A most striking finding, however, is that a significant number of grants go to faculty who are actively involved in the Association. Forty-two applications were received for the 1966-67 academic year, twenty-two were funded, and ten of the recipients were already or were soon to become active representatives in the Association. In 1967-68, nineteen grants for developing research proposals, totaling $7,458 were awarded to faculty under the CORD project. Nine of the nineteen recipients were active in a variety of Association activities.

This phenomenon can be explained a number of ways. For some, the grant precedes committee membership and for others involvement follows.

---

[39] Oscar Grusky, "Career Mobility and Organizational Commitment," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10:490.

Possibly those familiar with the Association by virtue of their participation, learn about and take advantage of funding opportunities; or someone becomes active for the purpose of making "contacts" for a grant; or "cosmopolitans" are likely to be active in the Association and in research; or having a proposal funded implicitly obligates the recipient to serve as a presidential nominee to a committee.

There is an interesting difference of opinion with regard to committee members obtaining grants for themselves. Many members of the Research Council have been able to fund their own projects. The author is not making a value judgment of this behavior: it is quite conceivable that the members are among the most sophisticated and talented faculty on their respective campuses, and that research funding for them, by whatever sources, should be expected. However, the general feeling of many committee members is that participation on the Council should be acknowledged by grants. One member said that he has let it be known that "he expects his back to be scratched next year as he has scratched his colleagues over the past few years." And he is sure that he will receive the grant.

A different orientation exists in the CORD committee. There a member who received two grants for himself and one for his colleague was not admired for his strategic prowess. The difference between the Research Council and the CORD committee is that the latter has few members who are interested in educational research. However, if committee composition changes and projects can be found by the members, as it seems might happen during the second year of the project, then attitudes might change as well.

Basically, research committee members spend their time trying to distribute the grants to their faculties, not to themselves. Although announcements of grant availability are made to all faculty members, those who are involved in consortium activities are overrepresented in the final selection. The research committee representatives report a number of criteria and methodologies they use in selecting their colleagues who will receive funds.

Some representatives respond favorably when they see a proposal from a department that produces few of them, some favor personal acquaintances, or desire to keep a person at the college, or grant money because of good past research, or no past research, or because of a good proposal. A few representatives distribute the money equally to all who apply; most rank the proposals with or without the help of a committee. Most representatives complain that they lack expertise in judging proposals from outside their own areas, but this does not prevent them from doing so, although some try to gain the objective judgments from others. Someone has to have the first and second proposals when money is allocated by going around a large table until the funds run out.

There is equitability by disciplines. In 1966, the distribution was as follows:

	Accepted	Rejected	Total	Reject Per Cent
Humanities	27	39	66	59
Soc. Sci.	36	25	61	41
Phys. Sci.	26	24	50	48
Education	6	5	11	45

Individuals, of course, work for a variety of rewards, some hard, others symbolic. Some representatives want the increase in power; others believe Association activities may be the basis for future rewards in their respective institutions. One faculty member hoped to establish an area institute based on the basic seminar sponsored by the Association. Another hoped to receive a higher salary based on his experimental work in the Association.

One staff member favors the use of central funds for rewards. He feels they may create change in the colleges:

> We must bribe the faculty through research grants and stimulate them through CORD. The heart of the matter is the faculty, and there is no real way you can reach them. You cannot tell them what to do or to teach, but hope that something will occur by the ripple effect.

Committee

There are two basic committee functions: problem-solving and reward distribution, some groups have a combination of the two. The problem-solving function will be treated in the next section.

Reward distribution is facilitated when the committees are composed of representatives having heterogeneous institutional goals and perspectives. If homogeneity obtained, there would be a greater degree of conflict.

It was mentioned that the representatives to the Research Council select the grant recipient on the basis of a variety of criteria, in addition to self-selection through application. Basically the choices are made by ranking the proposal at home and "going around the table until the money is expended." The heterogeneity of representational perceptions with regard to what they can expect from the distribution activity nullifies potential conflict.

First, the investigator will lay the groundwork for these perceptions. There is an explicit feeling that the colleges should share equitably in the distribution, each college contributes $1,000 and agrees to match it with other funds for their faculty who receive grants. However, there are some representatives who attempt to gain as much as they can by strategically manipulating the ranking according to the size of the grant requested. When someone "gets out of line" or "bares his teeth too much," in the words of one member he is ignored until his competitive impulses subside. Another press for equality is that alienation of committee colleagues is a bad tactic if one hopes to have personal grants funded. There is a fixed sum and the distribution is relatively "soft."

However, in spite of this press for equitability, until very recently the prestige institutions, who generally have better faculty and thus more competent proposals, have received somewhat more than they put in. And their continued satisfaction was based on this differential, even if it were but a few hundred dollars. The less prestigious schools basically got their fair share, and if they received less, they still, from a total view of all the rewards of membership, received enough to remain members. There were different motivations involved, and this is all-important. One school reinforced its standing, but another gained prestige by "competing" with the sister institutions and not faring too badly. If they had all wanted to reinforce their perceptions of common prestige there would have likely been more conflict for the funds.

Differential rewards prevented it. As the gap closes and the "better schools" do less well, they question the grant activity, and wonder if it might not be more efficient just to add the association's research funds to their own internal one.

One consequence of the general press for equitability is that some very poor proposals are funded; this is even recognized by the representatives from whose college they come. One can hope that the stimulation of poor research will eventually increase the quality of the faculty's efforts as they gain experience. But with institutions having various qualities of faculty, the long-range perspective means that in the short run quality is sacrificed for equitability: better proposals from some institutions do not receive funding because of a non-intellective criterion.

It has been indicated why the committee of admissions officers has a very successful but limited program. They are externally oriented, face constraints from the state system, but are concerned about maintaining the individual images that their institutions exude. Another important factor is that enough differences exist among the institutions so that the counselor program is able to succeed.

The Association conducted a survey of duplicate applications for the 1966-67 school year, for the purpose of trying to gain approval for a common application form. College I was not a member when the figures were assembled, College A did not submit statistics, and College B, the community college was not really involved because of its unique nature as a public institution. The figures of the remaining institutions indicate a total of 1,556 duplicate applications. College C shared 189 applications with other members of the Association, College D shared 297, College E shared 410, College F shared 239, College G shared 95, and College H shared 326. The largest number of duplications were between Colleges E and H (143), and Colleges E and D (110). It is interesting that the only admissions officers who said these statistics were significant had the most to gain by a common application form: College G, the two-year institution that had a small share of the high school graduate market, and College F which had a low prestige rating by most of the other schools and which could only gain by being considered with her more prestigious neighbors.

There were some surprise findings. Although there are similarities in curriculum and prestige among Colleges E, D, and H, Colleges E and F have different prestige ratings, and the fact that they shared 73 applications could not have been well-accepted by one of the schools.

However, two significant factors allow for cooperation: there are enough differences among the colleges to attract a different student body, and the committee, responding to environmental pressures, decided to follow an integrative strategy of increasing the joint gain, thereby allowing "soft distribution" of this gain to more likely occur.

The public and private two-year colleges appeal to a specific clientele. The four-year institutions have some differences in admissions standards, there are several church affiliations, differences in rural-urban environments, and differences in tuition. There are enough dissimilarities to match the various interests and abilities of high school seniors so that heated competition does not exist.

The second major factor was the "decision" which was both explicit and implicit, to enlarge the area and the intensity of recruitment, rather than compete by utilizing a fixed-sum, variable share payoff situation.

Many of the colleges now recruit outside New York State, and each year they host guidance counselors from different sections of the nation. There are some admissions officers who feel that they ought to attempt increasing the harvest from already cultivated fields rather than begin new ploughings, but a national student body has educational and prestige overtones that are missing with local people.

In essence, the admissions officers chose to increase the joint gain through an integrative strategy, and what with the natural differences among the colleges and the limited appetites for new students, a soft strategy could be assumed in distribution.

The Development Officers cooperate in exchanging tips about foundation monies that are based on specific research projects, not general purpose grants. In short, heterogeneity of institutional needs is favorably related to cooperative interaction of consortium participants for reward purposes.

Organization

It has been indicated that both the rewards and costs to the institution are minimal. As one staff member suggested, "They operate with mirrors." Certainly there are costs in time and in modifications of self-concepts, but not in hard resources. Over half of the dues are returned to the institutions via the research council grants and visiting scholars program. Also, many individual faculty receive $300 each from a state grant for participation in a non-western seminar and each school is paid $2,000 for the time of a representative to the CORD committee. The cash is returned, and it brings more than if each college spent it itself.

However, when examining the rewards that institutions receive from membership, not only should the total situation be kept in mind, but the fact that some symbolic rewards are worth a great deal more than certain monetary gains. An institution might gracefully accept less research funds for the prestige of competition, or for being able to use the list of visiting scholars as propaganda to incoming freshmen. The two-year institutions may accept a lower status position for a greater opportunity to transfer its graduates to the four-year colleges. In fact, a four-year institution in the Association regularly recommends that prospective freshmen go to a two-year college in the consortium if the former school is filled. They can then transfer from the junior college after they receive the associate degree. The two-year institution mails catalogs and applications to them the same day the letter is mailed from the four-year school, and this coordination is planned.

The case study will close with a discussion of the second function of the Association: problem-solving.

PROBLEM-SOLVING

Most of the Association committees have a problem-solving rather than reward function. The members must decide on means as well as ends. Unlike the reward function which flourishes with heterogeneous motives and expectations, problem-solving depends on the homogeneity of needs under consideration. Homogeneity does not imply unanimity or lack of dissension among the group members. It merely means that the representatives are able to meet similar needs through interaction, that the members represent different functional areas that are similar in professionally relevant respects.

The following examples will indicate what is meant: One of the three consultants to the librarian's committee was asked "to examine the existing situation, to aid in delineating goals for more productive cooperation, and to outline methods and systems of improving individual and collective operations." After making his recommendations, he wrote:

> This group of colleges has sufficiently standardized processes and goals so that the separate libraries ought to be able to accept unified processing better than other libraries (in other parts of the country) which have far less homogeneous collections, goals, (and) methods.

Many registrars believe that their problems and operations are uniquely related to the philosophies and purposes of their institutions. There may be only a half dozen methods of registering students, but minor variations and traditions take on some importance. In short, the registrars' internal orientation is not conducive to cooperation. However, a registrar who had nothing to share with his Association colleagues, was planning to visit an institution outside the consortium to discuss operational problems associated with a specialized curriculum they both had.

Similarly, the business managers have had very few meetings, and those they do have are information sharing rather than project development oriented. Business managers share similar problems and procedures depending on whether they are "public" or "private" and if they are of a similar size.

In addition, visiting scholar committee members have difficulty narrowing down the choice of speakers because of heterogeneous needs; faculty members collaborate when they are interested in similar problems; the public two-year college representatives sponsor seminars for other two-year institutions that have similar curricula and problems; and the scholarly journal committee members have different standards with regard to what is publishable material, and they have not agreed in six years.

In short, institutional representatives identify problem-solving sources as those which are functionally and structurally similar to their own.

CONCLUSION

Most Association members are internally oriented and if unable to identify problem-solving or reward outputs for themselves, do not involve themselves in joint affairs. In addition, there is peripheral involvement. Coser[40] suggests that "loosely organized groups, in which members participate segmentally rather than with total personality are less likely to experience intensified conflict...." "Given segmental participation," he says, "the very multiplicity of conflicts in itself tend to constitute a check against the breakdown of consensus."

---

[40] Lewis Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict, The Free Press, New York, 1956, p. 76.

There is Association consensus in non-threatening, non-strategic areas. But the lack of agreement and fear of eroding institutional autonomy checks consensus and joint action in areas that matter.

CHAPTER V

THE MASTERS UNIVERSITY--LEWIS STATE COLLEGE PROJECT

HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

In October 1964, an Associate Professor of Business at Masters University, in the northern United States, visited Lewis State College, a Negro institution in the South, to recruit candidates to do advanced work in industrial administration. It was during this contact that the Professor, a Negro, discussed a possible long-term cooperative relationship between Lewis and Masters, discussions which were followed by a series of visitations between administrative officers and faculty of the two institutions and subsequent funding under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965--"Strengthening Developing Institutions."

The program between these colleges, a bi-lateral between a developing and a "host" institution is one of 220 funded with $30,000,000 in fiscal year 1968. Developing institutions can be predominantly Negro or predominantly white--both types of colleges take advantage of the available funds. The dynamics described below are the result of interactions between a developing Negro college and an established white university; and although the racial differences do affect the relationship, it is the small, relatively poor college-mainstream university pattern that is being explored.

Following the October 1964 meeting, the Associate Professor returned to his campus to discuss the proposal with his Acting President, but because of their limited experience with inter-institutional cooperatives, they both met with the President of the state system who himself had developed such a program in his previous position. The President suggested in February 1965 "that explorations to develop scientific programs start immediately, (and) a research grant supported by his office was made available to facilitate such efforts."

In the early spring the Northern Professor went to Lewis State College to explore possible areas of cooperation, and meetings with the President and Vice-President, who was President-designate, centered about the following areas: student exchange programs whereby juniors from Lewis would spend a year at Masters under a pre-graduate fellowship, graduate fellowships for faculty desiring to do further work toward the Ph.D., experimental projects using television and other media at Lewis, workshops to upgrade and stimulate both faculty and students at Lewis, and experiments in inter-disciplinary courses to fill in voids in the Southern institution's social science curriculum.

In April and May the Presidents and Academic Vice-Presidents exchanged visits and they agreed "to take the necessary steps to qualify and secure foundation and/or governmental financial support for a long-range cooperative relationship," but they also agreed to proceed with programs that were feasible without external support.

In this spirit, a guest lecturer was invited by Lewis to participate in the Summer Session and Masters provided two graduate assistantships to Lewis seniors for the following academic year.

Two other early developments had a significant impact on the evolving relationship. In the fall, the President-designate at Lewis decided to spend a year "interning" with the new President at Masters University. Although the internship was not directly related to the proposed cooperative, a deep and affectionate relationship developed between the two leaders and provided the basis for the warm regard that each has for his counterpart and for the ease and openness of communication between the top offices today.

In December, in an effort to learn about Lewis College, ten faculty from Masters travelled south to "assess" the cooperating institution's program of studies in the liberal arts. This initial mass interaction on the part of the Masters faculty had both positive and negative effects that will be discussed in later sections of this study. In the main, however, the Masters faculty were shocked and dismayed by what they saw. The reactions were written up, accidently found their way to the Southern school, and set the strained tone of the relationship.

PURPOSES

INSTITUTIONAL

It was immediately recognized by Masters' administrators that the Project should be truly a cooperative effort. The University President and College President-designate agreed that "the whole direction of this effort (should be) toward developing a socially and professionally concerned but scientific and unsentimental approach to inter-institutional cooperation between regions in the United States." In addition, Masters' administrators took great care to stress in their verbal and written interactions with Lewis counterparts that the relationship would be reciprocal. Masters personnel knew that Lewis had more to gain from the project, obviously the agreement would not have been initiated if the Southern institution did not need help, but there was an overriding concern that the project might be perceived as a paternalistic affair. The question remains whether the consortium can, in actuality be other than "one-way," but officially there was an attempt to avoid unilateralism.

Letters to foundations for early support and working outlines of the cooperative programs support the interview data on this point. As examples, the following is quoted from an early draft of the program:

> OBJECTIVES
>
> A. To assist in the development of comprehensive College Readiness programs at Lewis and Masters.
>
> Expected Benefits--Lewis
>
> 1. Increases the scope and completeness of the College Readiness Programs now in progress.
> 2. Releases faculty (Lewis) for regular teaching assignments and opportunities to continue work for higher degrees (e.g. serious shortage of Ph.D.'s exist in the social and natural sciences).
>
> Expected Benefits--Masters
>
> 1. Increases the faculty's experience with College Readiness Programs. As a State University, Masters will be expected at some point in its development to contribute toward the education of disadvantaged youths in this State.
> 2. Increases the social growth of faculty and students at Masters. Participation will involve educational efforts in complex environmental settings (e.g. students are highly motivated but seriously bound by poor educational opportunities at home and in the schools).
>
> B. To provide Lewis State College with increased opportunities for graduate education and career development.

> Expected Development--Lewis
>
> 1. Increases the flow of qualified students toward non-teaching areas.
> 2. Provides more college teachers. The long-run solution to educational problems in the South must involve the development of more Negro Ph.D.'s.
>
> Expected Developments--Masters
>
> 1. Provides potential graduate students. Students from schools such as Lewis are capable of pursuing graduate work after some training in a well-structured graduate school readiness program.
> 2. Contributes to social growth of students from Lewis. Graduate readiness programs will entail the interaction of students at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

These early purposes served as the basis for the formal objectives for the continuing program. They are:

> To provide students at Lewis State College with unusual opportunities for graduate study and to increase the flow of graduate students to universities with developing graduate programs such as Masters.

The Southern institution hoped that those receiving a graduate education would "increase a source of potential college faculty that may be more inclined to consider relocating at Lewis."

> To encourage and increase opportunities for qualified faculty members of Lewis to accelerate their growth toward professional excellence in teaching and research through the pursuit of advanced degrees, and through post-graduate work at Masters tailored to serve expressed interests and needs of individuals.

The purpose was to stimulate and professionally up-grade Lewis faculty.

> To enrich and improve educational and administrative efforts through inter-university activities: lectures, research and teaching experiments, cultural events and symposia.

The two institutions saw "mutual benefits to be gained from reasoning together about problems, sharing new experiences, encouraging joint research experiments and sharing cultural activities."

> To investigate the usefulness of and to experiment with a variety of teaching media as a means of improving and enriching instruction.

Masters and Lewis felt such projects had potential given the faculty shortages both were experiencing. It should be noted, however, that this last objective was deleted from the description of the program given to the Masters faculty.

Although there was a concerned attempt to maintain complementariness in the consortium, given different payoffs resulting from the separate needs of the two colleges, some potential problems can be identified at this point. First, the Southern institution's payoffs seem to be more immediate and the Northern college's more long-range, thus the latter would experience initial costs and perceive the cooperative in this framework. Second, Masters is oriented toward the program, in spite of the rhetoric, because of social consciousness. In short, within the framework of the paradigm, Masters has a "statesman" orientation-peripheral involvement for external motivations. It will be interesting to observe the university's actions as their costs increase and they become, as a result, more centrally oriented. Lewis, on the other hand, is internally and centrally oriented to the gains that might accrue to them.

TITLE III FUNDING

The cooperative project had been initiated before foundation or federal funds were in sight. Visitations occurred, preliminary objectives were formulated, and impressions were made before Title III of the Higher Education Act became law. There had been and today there remain sincere attempts for reciprocal inputs and rewards. However, the "Strengthening Developing Institution Act" seriously compromised attempts at cooperative interaction. The criteria for awards robbed pride from the requesting institution and set the stage for a paternalistic attitude by the "host" university. Conceivably, problems of unilateralism might have developed in spite of Title III, but the probability of such an interaction pattern was that much greater because of the demeaning position the developing institution had to assume. According to the grant guidelines:[1]

> Colleges which have the desire and potential to contribute to the Nation's higher education resources but which are struggling for survival and isolated from the main currents of academic life may be eligible to apply for a grant....

Priorities will go toward institutions with "limited financial support, small endowment, and alumni with limited capital to offer; high dropout and transfer rates; limited offerings within minimum programs; obsolescence and inadequacies of laboratories, libraries, and other instructional facilities; low faculty salary and minimal faculty degree achievement; heavy faculty teaching load, sparse output of professional writings and limited professional activities; lack of expertise in administrative and fund raising areas; inaccessibility to cultural and academic offerings of other institutions either because of the institution's geographic isolation or the unavailability of such offerings to the institution."

---

[1] Higher Education Act of 1965, Title III--Strengthening Developing Institutions, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, August, 1966.

In response to the demands posed by these criteria, Lewis State College wrote an extensive description and evaluation of itself. In summary, its major strengths as it saw itself were: a willingness to raise its own stature, a comprehensive conception of its weaknesses, some established programs, and a body of students with good potential. Its weaknesses included "insufficient personnel in quality and quantity; lack of an active involvement by students and faculty in research and in major educational events in national academic life; and lack of exposure and depth in preparation to enable the students to pursue graduate work or to enter rewarding careers in industry...." These are but few of the weaknesses described, the list was followed by a description of the college's cultural isolation and plans for improvement by virtue of the cooperative with Masters. Although the Federal guidelines may have initiated a serious self-study, the rhetoric of the College's response did not equate with the actual pride held by the faculty and administration.

The guidelines did not detail the role of the cooperating agencies, except to act as contributors to their counterparts' improvement, and the regulations did not perceive any gains accruing to the host college.

But if the guidelines stress the unilateral nature of the interaction and inferiority of the recipient, it also placed the locus of responsibility for performance with the developing institution which is the college that receives the funds. The Office of Education desired "to support self-determination by the developing institutions in their election of alternative courses of action" with the long-range goal of assisting "institutions in arriving at the point where they can generate maximum support from other Federal support programs."[2]

This is the background of the bilateral cooperative--its history and the purposes for which it was established, given the constraints and spirit of the funding guidelines. The guidelines, however, were but one of the factors affecting the consortium. Of great importance, as well, were the environmental constraints, which follow the brief outline of the colleges.

BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE COLLEGES

Masters University is a state related institution which is in the process of developing from an undergraduate liberal arts college to a university center. This high prestige college enrolls 3,000 students. The faculty-student ratio is 1/12, 75% of the teaching staff hold doctorates, and the library contains 250,000 volumes. The College Board means are 622 Verbal and 639 Mathematical and 83% of the freshman class is in the top 10% of their high school graduating classes.

Lewis State College is a state related institution which has both liberal arts and education curricula for 2,000 women and 790 men. The faculty-student ratio is 1/21 and less than 20% of the teaching staff holds doctorates. The library houses 55,000 volumes. The students must possess a "C" average to be admitted and score a mean of 10.5 on the American College Testing Program (range 0-35).

---

[2] "Conference Workshop Sessions," Report of the Conference with Developing and Cooperating Institutions of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1968, pp. 64, 67.

THE ENVIRONMENT

The Federal guidelines required the developing institution to be "isolated from the main currents of academic life." Lewis State College addressed itself to its academic and cultural isolation in the proposal.

The developing institution, however, is also located in one of the least progressive states in the South and one which is recognized as having a very poor public educational system. The host institution, on the contrary, is in a state noted for its progressive social legislation and excellent public higher educational facilities. The large gap, however, was one of the motivating factors leading to initial financial support from the Northern State. In addition to it being in "vogue," the Northern educational leaders wanted to prod their Southern counterparts into becoming more involved in Negro education, to support the Negro colleges as they had the white schools. The Southern state's Board of Higher Education did not welcome what they saw as Yankee imperialism but were persuaded to accede to the proposal because of the heavy financial input they would gain.

There are, of course, normal problems that develop when state related institutions join in an agreement. For instance, Masters had to involve itself with an extraordinary amount of "red tape" to ship obsolete equipment to its sister institution. However, surmounting the legal difficulties of transferring public equipment to another political jurisdiction are the problems of having this infusion recognized by the legislative officers of the "developing state." One of the first expressions of commitment by the Masters administration was to invite Lewis librarians to the Northern campus to select duplicate books from the library. However, to avoid potential problems arising from having these books, which are stamped with Masters ownership, seen by the wrong persons, the volumes are officially "on loan."

Fear of the Southern state's response was justified in the minds of the protagonists. Neither white students nor faculty were allowed to matriculate or hold permanent appointment at the Negro colleges, and although this has been somewhat modified, Lewis administrators must "assume that the lectures and the consultation are supplementary to existing course work....We are explicitly avoiding any direct links between lectures and classroom teaching responsibilities."

This fear of state retribution, potentially evidenced in budget cuts, reduce meaningful interaction. Potential crises limit cooperation. Masters visitations are shortened and its faculty are not encouraged to give separate courses on the Southern campus. This leads to "crash programs" emphasizing workshops and full two-day schedules for visiting scholars. It also serves as an insulating device for the Southern college which can prevent unilateral programs by attributing repercussions of the legislature as the rationale.

Lewis has strongly and consistently barred Masters students from coming down who feel motivated by liberal political ideas. The administration can ill afford, it feels, to have its tenuous position compromised by a radical who "wants to spit in the local sheriff's eye." And the tension, it might be noted, is high on the Southern campus. Although the Negroes there are insulted if you call them "Blacks," there has been developing a sense of political consciousness, and police and national guardsmen have occupied the campus over the past few years. In fact, the social and political problems were severe enough in 1964, when the Northern Associate Professor made his initial visit, that he wrote the local FBI office to advise him of potential trouble as he, a Negro, was travelling with a white.

As repressive as many white faculty feel the Southern state is, so their Lewis counterparts have difficulty in adjusting to the different Northern environment. Many students taking courses experience "culture shock" in the freer and more open atmosphere, and faculty experience different degrees of frustration in observing the abundance of support and facilities their brethern have. One professor, seeing the equipment at Masters, became ill and had to retire to his motel.

Environmental differences also have an effect on the objectives and potential programs of the bilateral. The extremely poor educational background of the Southern students handicaps them in the Northern context on both the undergraduate and graduate levels, prompting many Masters respondents to suggest that Lewis would do better to relate to a better Southern institution where the norms and backgrounds of their students were more similar. On the other hand, if Masters entered the program to learn about disadvantaged students, they might better have reached local disadvantaged who will be their future clientele. There is a difference between the aggressive Black and the conservative Southern

Negro in educational preparation as well as in political expression.

The differences in environments have a determined effect on the cooperative arts program, with the exception of the visiting lecturers phase. The repressive atmosphere in the Southern state is not attuned to the freedom that the artist needs to produce good work; and theatre personnel, to do significant productions, must have intimate experience in legitimate theatre, and these exist in major urban areas.

There are serendipitious results as when a well-known Northern faculty artist attracts whites to the Negro campus and the local citizens subsequently extend invitations to the Negroes to attend the local symphony orchestra concerts. But, in all, physical distance between the two institutions, in this altruistically motivated exchange, has lesser impact than the political and social considerations that are in evidence.

THE ORGANIZATION

COORDINATORS

Masters

When the Masters Professor visited the President of the Northern public higher educational system, he convinced the gathering that the proposed cooperative would be unique: both institutions had state affiliations, had similar sized student bodies, and were "developing": Masters into a Ph.D. program. But large-scale proposals are the initiator's style. He is a Negro born in the same state as Lewis State College, did his Ph.D. work at the University of Illinois, has won numerous fellowships, and in addition to associate professorship status at Masters, is heavily published, an industrial consultant, and has been voted the outstanding young man of the year by the large city in which Masters is located.

He is a "dynamo," a synoptic thinker, whose proposals are worked out and administered by those who can translate bold ideas into routine. He is pursuasive and, according to many, is sensitive to success. There are numerous psychological motivations that people attributed to account for his involvement in the program: aggrandisement, working off guilt feelings for having "achieved," and altruism.

He was able to achieve a very close relationship with the President-elect and the Dean of Instruction at Lewis, to the latter he would sign letters with his first name in a relationship heavily burdened by formal diplomatic considerations. There is evidence that the Northern Professor and the Dean colluded in bringing change to the Lewis campus, in spite of reactions of local faculty. But for these, the Northerner had little respect. He administered the program, fearing disaster if they were responsible for it, and both lax administration on Lewis' part and a superior attitude by the Northern Professor are evident in the frequent correspondence between the two institutions. The program was perceived by Lewis faculty as belonging to the two coordinators.

The initiator left Masters at the end of the 1967 fiscal year, and although extremely frustrated by the difficulty of initiating and maintaining fruitful relationships with Lewis, wrote a "whitewash" evaluation of the program. It was only the threat of the new administrator not to cover the problems that led to a more accurate and troubled appraisal.

The new Coordinator, formerly involved in academic counseling at Masters and a member of the faculty committee overseeing the cooperative, does not have the stature of his predecessor. He lacks the doctorate and is unable, even if he has the desire, to run the program single-handedly as had been the case. The Coordinator was reduced in fact to executive secretary of the committee. Although responsible for initiating and administering the projects with Lewis, he is more accountable to his faculty "superiors." This position is acceptable to him. He conceives of himself as a catalyst, has spent many years working in poverty projects helping the disadvantaged, and for personal reasons, is quite insecure. Frequent reports were sent to his superior, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs, more for the safety of the Coordinator than for the enlightenment of the higher administrator.

The new Coordinator initially, and to this day, spends large blocks of time on the Southern campus. Although the trips are diminishing in number, he was initially there one week a month for seven months. And it was an extremely frustrating experience. It was and still is very difficult to gain the respect, attention, or concern of the Lewis faculty or administration, and it is only through a determined perseverance that he is able to gain their commitment to new joint ventures.

> Sometimes the problems seem so insurmountable that it seems foolish to even try anymore. But then there are individuals who are benefitting. Maybe we should shift the focus from the system as a whole and keep our score on those individuals who seem to benefit from what we are trying to do. The system is so impenetrable and resistant to change....It seems so hopeless to effect radical change in the system. I guess we should just look at individuals with the feeling that if we can affect a few it has been worth our time. Sort of like first aid and rehabilitation of individuals one by one.

The Coordinator has become a strategist in dealing with his Lewis colleagues. He personifies McCall and Simmon's statement that:

> We discover what we conceive to be alter's current interactive role, modifying our own lines of action on the basis of what we perceive alter's implications to be with respect to our manifest and latent plans of action. Having imputed a role to alter, we devise our own roles in light of what alter's putative role means to us.[3]

He not only attempts to satisfy Lewis faculty, he also tries to win over possible dissidents before they create problems.

Although he is somewhat disturbed that his administration is not supporting the cooperative as strongly as he would desire, he is becoming as disillusioned as his superiors are of the viability of the relationship.

The Coordinator was successful in his attempt to shift responsibility for the administration of the program to Lewis this year. He believes it should be their program, that paternalism would be reduced if Masters turned over the administration to the funded institution. Lewis resisted this change. Not only is there a lack of administrative depth, in quality and in numbers at that college, but now it squarely places the success or failure of the program in their hands.

Lewis State College

The Lewis Coordinator achieved a great deal more power after the first Masters liaison left and the second turned over the administrative functions to Lewis. In order to understand this coordinator's actions, one must be sensitive to the environmental situation in which he operates.

Lewis is split into numerous factions, based on disciplinary and personal differences. The investigator was told and observed the satisfaction with which "colleagues" told uncomplimentary stories about each other. As will be explained later, Lewis is very much a traditional society, and the quarreling based on small family matters is striking to the outsider. In addition, there are obvious power plays on this authoritarian campus composed of "locals"; and the control of a few hundred thousand dollars, which was the 1967-68 budget, provides great potential power. In this case, it is used.

---

[3] George J. McCall and J. L. Simmons, Identities and Interactions, The Free Press, New York, 1966, p. 136.

The Lewis Coordinator reports to the President and thus, complaints about expenditures must be severe before one goes to the top. Programs are judged impossible to conduct, before and after negotiations between representatives of the two institutions. As one example of this is the following letter between the Chairman of the cooperative committee at Masters and the Lewis Coordinator:

> Pursuant to our phone conversation with you on May 28, 1968, I sat down and did some contemplating. I had hoped that the suggested personnel visits mentioned in my recent report could get underway on schedule, and was somewhat perplexed by the diverse reasons in respect to the proposed trip by Mr. _______, and to why such a trip might be difficult to arrange by your office at this time.
>
> You mentioned current budgetary considerations, student registration during the June 2-8 period, the problem of getting the 'O.K.' through the necessary administrative channels, as well as the fact that our institutions differ in that Masters is research oriented while Lewis is teacher oriented as grounds for at least a delay, and possibly the non-existence of portions of my suggestions.
>
> I am indeed perplexed by each reason, and taken back by all four. I am unable to make any specific comment on the budgetary considerations, but having dealt with federal funds myself, I find it

INSTITUTIONAL PRESIDENTS

Masters

Initial contacts had been made before the current President of Masters University had been selected. He, however, was very much in favor of the proposed cooperative between the two institutions, and in fact, invited the President-elect to spend a year interning with him.

The President, like many Masters participants, felt that he could fulfill both social and educational objectives by participating in the cooperative. Although it may not have been an initial consideration, the cooperative now means fulfilling an obligation without subjecting oneself to continuous campus protests by a group of Afro-American students.

A very close relationship developed between the President and the President-elect, each was learning and each confided in the other.

Lewis

The President-elect of Lewis State College had done his Ph.D. work at the University of Chicago, and was a former Lewis College graduate. He had been disturbed by what he saw as the demeaning posture his President had taken with the white State Board of Higher Education, selling one's pride for a few pennies. He had been promised the presidency, but the incumbent kept extending his tenure.

The President-elect knew Lewis well, was high on the staff structure to gain an overview of the needs and had the power to enforce his will. He pressed the incumbent President to agree to the cooperative in order for the liberal arts and science components to be strengthened. He has been somewhat cooler to the project since his inauguration, and this

> hard to conceive of the difficulty you mention concerning the support of this trip under a variety of headings within the project.
>
> It is often necessary for personnel to leave the campus, and I would gather registration week to be as viable a period as when classes are in session. Earlier conferences with Mr. ________ indicated this would be an appropriate period to schedule a visit.
>
> I haven't the foggiest of what is meant by the difficulty of getting approval through the proper administrative channels....
>
> I would like to think that we do place a great deal of emphasis on undergraduate instruction....
>
> I feel strongly that it would indeed be unfortunate if an administrative chain were to dampen what I consider to be a truly cooperative and beneficial program wherein both of our institutions can profit immensely.

The spirit of the two positions taken above is mirrored in other negotiations.

In addition, the Coordinator, who is not generally respected on his own campus, fails to perform basic administrative functions such as telling Masters when they are sending undergraduates up and a phone call from the airport is the first notification, or failing to tell transfer students that they are not receiving a stipend and the first indication of this is when the checks do not arrive.

The administrative problems are an overriding factor in the frustrations felt by the Masters faculty and administration. And it is control over such a large fund that reinforces the coordinator's prerogatives and idiosyncracies.

might be expected given the different mode of operation between the line and staff positions and the "vested interests" he inherited. He is extremely cautious about Masters student involvement at Lewis lest the state legislature be upset, cuts the length of proposed visits to the Northern campus, and suggests that some North-South faculty interaction not occur.

However, if the warm and open relationship did not exist among the two presidents, conflicts would be sharper. Complaints on either side filter in and are discussed personally by the leaders before they erupt into major breeches. At the same time, some differences are not brought into the open, but smoulder.

INDIVIDUAL COLLEGES

In this section of the case study the author will describe the two cooperating institutions, their interaction, and the concept of "pride" as it relates to the consortium.

Lewis State College

Lewis State College, with liberal arts and education curricula, can best be understood through juxtaposition with Masters University. At Lewis there is a very strong authoritarian relationship between the faculty and administration, and the students who are also under strict parietal rules. Professors talk down to students and in many instances treat them with contempt. It is a traditional society: when the first contingent of Masters faculty went down they were invited to Christmas dinner with the local faculty, and, to their embarrassment, were given Christmas presents. A strong "collegiate" atmosphere exists: sports and beauty pageants are very important campus events. The school has a limited number of courses: the catalog mirrors any Northern university's but very few of the supposed offerings are actually given because of limited faculty. The students arrive with poor educational backgrounds and this forces the college to devote its freshman year to a great deal of remedial work. As an example of the inadequate college preparation, over 60% of the student body scored between ninth and eleventh grade placement on the California Reading Test that measures vocabulary growth and reading comprehension. Less than 5% were at freshman college level.

According to Nabrit, White, and Zacharias:

> Those members of the faculty who have proceeded through the Negro educational system are likely to be at best half educated....The nature of their own training makes it unlikely that they will be able, by their own unaided efforts, to move the system forward; they are more likely to be its victims than its saviors.[4]

The author was unable to gauge the faculty's competence, but Masters faculty, who have worked with their counterparts, rank it as low, with some rare exceptions. There have been some infusions from outside--either through experimental programs or from faculty who gain their degrees from reputable universities. But one experimental program is isolated from the regular curriculum with questionable transfer of ideas in the future; and faculty from the "outside," if Negro, are looked upon with suspicion; if white, with suspicion and varying degrees of hostility.

---

[4] Samuel N. Nabrit, Stephen White, and Jerrold R. Zacharias, "Program for Negro Colleges," in L. C. Howard, ed., Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Institute of Human Relations, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1967, pp. 29-30.

There is also a very unrealistic attitude about the educational process. As an example, the following is quoted from a brochure to attract undergraduates into the physics program. There was no realistic assessment of requirements, only that:

> an efficient program of undergraduate training makes graduate study easier, pleasant, enjoyable. The physics major includes two years of foreign languages and the experience of independent investigation in the Advanced Laboratory--desirable prerequisites to graduate study.

There is also the reinforcement of prejudicial attitudes held by some whites toward Negroes, but in this case by Negroes toward Negroes. About handling expensive equipment in the biology program, the instructions read:

> Negligence and slothfulness can result in extensive loss....It is our obligation as good citizens and disciplined people to be constantly mindful of expenses involved in a good biology program.

Masters University

Masters University is developing from an elite state related liberal arts college, and it is growing rapidly. Graduate work began in 1961 and there are now M.A.'s offered in twenty-four areas and Ph.D.'s in twelve. The campus has a strong intellectual tone that supports academic freedom by students and faculty, and the faculty members have major professional or disciplinary leanings.

Interaction

Colleges.--Given the different environments at the respective institutions it is not surprising that articulation has proven difficult.

An initial attraction of the cooperative was that problems could be met jointly because of institutional similarities in sizes of student bodies, external relationships, and stages of growth. And although common institutional research could be developed in the area of college-state relationships, cooperation in academic areas finds little complementariness.

Lewis, like most state colleges, does not wish to think of itself as a teacher training institution. It has a liberal arts program whose faculty feel superior to the educational faculty. But, in fact, it is a teachers college. The 1966 placement figures show:

7%	graduate or professional school
70%	teaching
9%	organizational positions
3%	housewives
11%	military or ?

And most of the students taking the liberal arts curriculum enter teaching, given the need and environmental constraints on Negroes in the Deep South.

On the other hand, faculty at Masters University have contempt for education courses and for an institution with such a purpose.

The investigation suggests that a more viable relationship would exist if the colleges had similar objectives in fact rather than in ideals. A strong state teachers college, preferably in the South where norms and backgrounds would be similar, would seem to offer the most productive relationship for solving common problems. In this context, common experiments could be run with institutions whose representatives had similar interests, spoke the same language, and had similar problems. This suggestion anticipates two issues to be discussed later: first, many Lewis faculty take a great deal of pride in relating to a name Northern university; second, there is considerable evidence that Lewis is not interested in common problem-solving, but in the rewards that accrue to them. Thus, as suggested in the previous case anslysis, heterogeneity and not homogeneity would prove functional for rewards.

If homogeneity of institutions with respect to purpose might aid in the posing and solution of problems with in-depth participation by each institution, the forward-looking and disciplinary oriented faculty, some of whom exist at Lewis, would be clearly disturbed. Some of the dynamic faculty are less interested in what they are than in what they can become. Said one Lewis professor, "We want to be a top liberal arts college funneling into the professions. If they want to teach, let them go." For this faculty member, homogeneity would be a Masters University relationship, but in his case, ideals far outrun realistic expectations based upon a number of constraints: degree of potential funding, nature of the student body, and recruiting power of the institution.

Although there is a desire by Masters for reciprocal interaction, there is also the recognition that the relationship is unilateral, and for good reason. "This is a research institution by inclination and administrative pressure." There is little to gain through Lewis except having worked with disadvantaged students and this may not come for some time.

Many Masters faculty are dismayed and amazed at what they consider to be a closed system, a stifling atmosphere on the Lewis campus. They observe inadequately prepared faculty, poor utilization of the Ph.D.'s, inadequate library facilities--and a well-fed football team. There is the recognition that sports is an avenue for Negro upward mobility, but the environmental conditions turn many away from interaction. "Mutual esteem is highly related to group attractiveness and effectiveness."[5]

There are, however, a number of Masters faculty who are impressed with the level of accomplishment at the Southern campus, given the conditions under which it exists. Said some active members:

> The men in chemistry are industrious; to improve the field we can give these people a chance to spend their time teaching, rather than having to do the dogwork.
>
> I had the feeling that I was talking to students who were as receptive to what I said as many of our students, perhaps more so.
>
> Conversations with Mr. ______ and the present members of the very capable biology staff lead me to believe that they are genuinely interested in using the equipment they have acquired, and are highly motivated to further their professional capacities through organized research efforts when time is available.

Inasmuch as the chemistry and biology departments are among the few strong areas in the liberal arts, such attitudes are understandable. But there can also be similar weaknesses. A member of the Masters physics department, who interacts well with his counterpart, indicated that Lewis students were not that different from his regularly matriculated students who come from small colleges, have parochial backgrounds, need remedial work, and aspire to work in the local industry.

---

[5] Bernard Bass, Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1960, p. 296.

One of the similarities between the two institutions is that they are still developing. However, internal development at Masters detracted from potential inputs to Lewis. For instance, the Masters chemistry department was moving into new buildings, establishing new programs, and had little time remaining to consider other institutions. As crisis limits the viability and reduces the communications channels of organizations, so internal development and growth problems not only cost scarce resources but reduce the probability of an external orientation. The same possibility also holds for the Lewis campus. There may be forces within institutions that are undergoing internal tremors that reduce the potentiality for boundary transactions.

Faculty and Staff Interaction

There has been a steady flow of participants in each direction. Between February and April 1967, six Masters representatives spent 127 man days in the South and one Lewis staff spent 14 days in the North. During the period July-December 1967, thirteen Lewis staff and thirty-six Masters people travelled to each other's campuses. In all, considerably more man days are spent in the South by workshop participants, concert musicians, or course lecturers. Faculty and staff come North to help plan the workshops and to learn what their counterparts are doing.

Often it is with considerable difficulty that Masters representatives are able to coax their counterparts to visit them. The Masters Coordinator had been trying for over a year to have his counterpart visit the campus, and when he finally did arrive it was only for a few hours. He came to have the proposal for Federal support signed, and in order to accommodate a reading of the documents, the Masters administration forced the Southern liaison to re-schedule his early flight to Washington.

The communications that do exist are costly: energies are expended to phrase the letters in the "proper" language; time is spent in repetitive requests for routine administrative tasks and actions; it is expensive by phone and time-consuming by mail. Many of the communications are inaccurate either by design or through negligence and rumors breed on this situation. For instance, a Lewis faculty member called the Northern Coordinator's office to substantiate the "rumor" that Lewis exchange students were without accommodations and money.

The Southern Coordinator did not complain about Northern communication. The Masters representative said, "We hear absolutely nothing. The silence is deadening." Scheff suggests with little or no communication, coordination is a function of consensus--which in this case rarely exists.[6]

Student Exchanges

A significant feature of the initial objectives of the cooperative were student programs whereby Lewis undergraduates would come North for coursework. Masters University originally sponsored summer workshops, entered four junior year students in a "graduate readiness program" which gave the Southern student an opportunity to study in a graduate school environment where rigorous expectations were encountered, provided four graduate assistantships for Lewis bacallaureate holders, and a "fifth year" program for graduating seniors who desired to come up to graduate school level.

---

[6] Thomas J. Scheff, "A Theory of Social Coordination Applicable to Mixed-Motive Games," Sociometry, 30:226.

Many of these programs were deleted because of a reduction of Federal funds; but, in all, they were judged unsuccessful by both campuses, in spite of the proposals rhetoric.

The students may well have learned a great deal of academic material and may have learned something about the society that few had previously entered. But the expectations of the Masters faculty generally went unmet and the students created difficulties upon returning to the Southern campus.

In addition to being victims of a poor Southern educational system, the Negro students are treated with contempt rather than understanding by their instructors. Students fear to answer questions in class for fear of being incorrect. Said one about a classroom experience at Masters, "I never before acquired knowledge in such a pleasant atmosphere, feeling free to say anything right or wrong, without being ridiculed." Rote learning is the norm at the Southern school and the Northern instructors must attempt to persuade the students to participate in class discussions.

Not only did the students experience social adjustment problems in the North, they also received mediocre to poor evaluations by the professors. The students, who were the best that Lewis had to offer, were usually highly motivated, and only a mere few excelled in the open environment. The following faculty comments were the norm:

> About graduate students the professors said--
>
> She was conscientious but never read and thought beyond superficial and conventional level. Her previous training hadn't equipped her to analyze writing; she should take introductory courses.

> She has no organization of the mind. Music 291 was too difficult for her intellectual level. We should attack the fundamentals first.
>
> A graduate student received a "D" in Biology 283 because of his inability to grasp concepts, to communicate or assimilate knowledge. He could get an M.A. somewhere, but not here. A certificate program or internship would have been more valuable to him and considerably less devastating.
>
> A student received a "D" in Philosophy 111 because her papers were plagiarized from texts.

These situations destroyed many of these students' images of themselves. They had excelled at Lewis, but at Masters they found themselves doing mediocre work at best.

It was planned that the undergraduates returning to the South would become tutors in the Lewis courses. Many did, but they also found upon their return that no provisions either for continued financial aid or housing had been made for them. They had been "deserted" by their home campus administrators, treated as "turncoats."

Many of the students experienced culture shock upon their return to the South. Many could not see going back to what one called a "third grade atmosphere." Students had tasted "excellence," knew where they stood in relation to top students, and would no longer accept what they considered to be the myth of Lewis' superior education. A large number of the students refused to study during their senior year as a reaction to the meaningless rhetoric about Lewis and a realization of how educated they really were. Some mimeographed an anonymous tattle sheet called the Gadfly. It mocked faculty, and alluded to improper personal conduct and lack of expertise.

The Lewis faculty were rather cool to the idea of continued student interaction on the Masters campus.

Although it was initially hoped that the Northern bachelor degree holders would attend Lewis to obtain teaching competence by enrolling in the education curriculum, no one has travelled that route. Courses are taught on a very elementary level at Lewis for someone wanting a taste of advanced work and for Masters students the costs, both financial and social, would be very great.

Lewis faculty and staff cannot understand the lack of reciprocal exchanges by Masters students. Many of the Southerners have a great deal of pride in their education faculty.

Pride

Lewis sent the best students it had to offer and they not only failed academically, but became disciplinary problems upon their return. The poor student evaluations were taken by many Lewis faculty as being judgments on their teaching proficiency.

However, the introduction of "pride" occurred earlier in the relationship when the grading procedure between the two institutions were developed.

The top administrative officers of the two colleges agreed that the Lewis students, because of poor preparation, would be evaluated in descriptive terms by the Masters faculty while Lewis would assign the grade based on how well the student performed in accordance with local norms.

Both Masters and Lewis faculty committees rejected this proposal. The Masters people did not want to use a double standard and wished to place the students in a realistic educationally demanding situation. The Lewis faculty did not want their students to be the objects of handout grades and believed their best students could perform at the required level.

After a great deal of discussion at all levels, the agreed upon grading procedure included the following among its provisions:

> a. Visiting students from the Project should be appraised but not graded on the same basis as Masters students.
>
> b. 'Junior Year' students should not be treated as transfer students to Masters but as 'exchange' students receiving evaluations but not grades. Masters faculty could use the S-U grading system.
>
> c. Upon completion of the junior year, Masters will send to Lewis for each junior student a transcript of courses taken and a 'package' containing course descriptions, comments, and general evaluative information. Lewis faculty should study course outlines and choose a course at Lewis equitable to the one taken at Masters, then administer a standardized test to determine if the student can pass on the basis of the standardized test administered by Lewis.

In addition, strong efforts were made to provide supportive counseling and the normal course load was reduced.

Pride dictated a more stringent evaluation system than originally planned by the Presidents; self-conceptions were damaged as a result of those evaluations, producing strong negative reactions to the program.

"Pride" in the grading procedures was the result of an unrealistic evaluation of one's strengths. If "cooperation is born of awareness of limitations,"[7] then proudly self-sufficient, virile institutions and members will find such interaction difficult. And so, an unrealistic assessment of faculty credential needs led to a decrease in the number of graduates going from Masters to teach at Lewis.

In the fall of 1968, Lewis administration attempted to fill all new faculty positions with the Ph.D. M.A. degree holders are more likely to work in a teaching rather than a research institution and a number of Masters student requests for information about teaching at Lewis were recorded. With little potential for fruition, the student advances were not encouraged.

Realistically, given the nature of the student body and the teaching thrust of the college, Ph.D.'s were needed more for public relations than for legitimate functions. As Nabrit, White, and Zacharias maintain with regard to Ph.D. holders coming into the Negro institution from the outside:

> (They) are forced by the nature of the student body to lower their sights in becoming part of an institution which does not reflect their aspirations nor offer them the opportunities which led them to seek a career in college teaching. They have neither time nor facilities to continue their own research, nor the support of talented and qualified associates. In consequences, they soon fall out of the mainstream of research, and this inevitably prejudices their own capacity as instructors.[8]

Lewis needs good dedicated teachers, not a faculty trained to conduct research.

---

[7] Eldon Johnson, "Cooperation in Higher Education," Liberal Education, 48:475.

[8] Nabrit, et. al., loc. cit.

Lewis State College has a great deal of pride in what it has been able to accomplish in an alien environment. And this pride is difficult to maintain when Masters faculty go down to "help the peasants" or "evaluate their program."

In a situation where Lewis' greatest need is to help the faculty with an apprentice program, faculty do not attend scholarly meetings or programs sponsored by the cooperative since it might be seen as admitting a lack of knowledge. The faculty resent help and a paternalistic attitude is read into situations, regardless of its actual existence.

Although some Masters faculty do use the visits for giving direction, there is, on the part of Masters administration, a great concern that tact and diplomacy be part of the visiting faculty's equipment. And in the projects which have sustained themselves, Lewis people admit that "they never got the feeling that Masters was superior to us. They wanted to know what we wanted done."

Pride and self-conceptions are affected when Masters faculty and administration are treated superbly by their Southern hosts, teach classes, and give lectures, and when Lewis faculty are "hidden" on the Northern campus. The Southern faculty members wonder why they cannot teach a guest section or why they meet students in faculty members' houses rather in meaningful encounters. Some Lewis faculty fear interaction with their counterparts; they think they might not be qualified, and with few exceptions, they have accurately read the expectations of their colleagues.

These conditions lead to a great deal of role playing. The polite, superficial level is underlaid with feelings of distrust, inadequacy, and superiority.

Pride must be "interlaced with common sense," as one Lewis faculty member put it. Cooperative programs will succeed when deficiencies are recognized and built upon. The Lewis English Department recognized the basic remedial problems of freshmen and worked closely with Masters faculty to devise a tutorial program which after two years has been evaluated very favorably by the two colleges. The concept of a tutorial was not well accepted by many Lewis faculty and some involved students were hostile to the project, feeling degraded before their peers.

Pride interfered with the progress of the bilateral. Many Masters professors showed little respect for their counterparts, with the more sensitive Masters faculty attempting to cover the wounds their colleagues made. Lewis faculty want to be treated with professional respect, which is difficult when they interact with research-oriented professors.

When Lewis' strong points and faculty are recognized by Masters, when Lewis looks at itself realistically, and "pride is interlaced with common sense," projects result. But healthy pride is difficult to maintain when a Southern faculty member says he goes North "for a benevolency."

PROGRAMMING

PLANNING

The first large-scale exploratory visitation for planning occurred in December 1965 by a group of ten Masters faculty and the project leader. They talked to their disciplinary counterparts on the Lewis campus, visited the library to assess the holdings in their fields, talked to students, and during the two evenings they were there, discussed the findings of their day's adventures, recording the different arguments.

The faculty members were awed by the situation. Some withdrew because of what they felt were the magnitude and intractability of the problems. A few were impressed by the efforts expended by their Lewis colleagues in spite of conditions and continued to work on the committee. The majority, however, reacted in the following fashion:

> In a short report, the faculty member noted that Lewis lacked equipment of all sorts, had terrible class sizes, poor faculty preparation, black faculty paternalism, student cheating, the feeling that students must "keep in line or their financial aid will be terminated, too many athletic scholarships, controversial books restricted from the bookstore, inadequate library resources, and an impossible faculty load. "On the whole," he said, "I think the faculty is competent to do work at the level now required; that is, to prepare secondary school teachers....It would be a different matter if they were offering a liberal arts program...."

As a result of conditions at Lewis, the Masters faculty gave peripheral attention to the project after they returned to their campus. In the words of one, "The student and faculty deficiencies could not be erased in a semester, it would take five years." The cost would be too great for more significant involvement that would hold the promise of success. An altruistic motivation will generate just so much involvement, costs are considered as involvement becomes more central.

Two major accidents occurred during the initial planning stages. First, a written report of the Masters visitation was seen by the Lewis President-elect who was interning on the Northern campus. Not only were copies of the critical document sent South, but the Northern reaction to Lewis also nearly caused the program to terminate. Hastily arranged meetings were convened with the Lewis President-elect to persuade him to continue his commitment. Second, a Lewis biology professor coming North was unable to make an appointment with his counterpart because the latter did not have the time to see the Southerner. This event dealt a sharp blow to the Lewis biologist. When he became Dean, it placed an unsympathetic administrator in a position to harm the project's growth, which it did.

The first Masters Coordinator, a synoptic thinker, had developed a multi-phased project development time schedule. Phase I from July 1966 to August 1966 included, among other summer projects, a workshop involving development of a physics laboratory, intensive courses in languages and social sciences at Lewis; Phase II from September 1966 to the following August, included a variety of student programs at Masters and faculty exchanges; and Phase III during the 1967-68 academic year, added the experimental use of closed circuit television as an aid to teaching.

However, planning continued during and after the frequent visits made to the Southern campus. Curricular experiments were developed, the student programs operationalized, and institutional studies planned.

The Masters Coordinator worked virtually alone on his campus in the planning of these projects. Some administrators did contribute, but faculty were used as resource people and as contributors to projects for which the groundwork had been laid. Similarly, at Lewis the Dean of Instruction worked to the exclusion of faculty. When Lewis faculty were asked to visit the Northern campus to approve courses their students would take up there in the exchange programs, for many faculty this was the first they knew that such a cooperative arrangement had been made.

The program was in the hands of both administrations, and peripheral faculty support may very well have resulted from their initial and continued exclusion in program-planning and policy-making.

To some extent, the exclusive involvement of top administrators was a reaction to the relatively short time period that was available to complete the proposal for funding. Many observers of consortia believe that cooperative programs must start in peripheral areas and grow slowly. A relaxed atmosphere did not exist because of the dynamism of the protagonist at Masters and the need to plan projects prematurely for government funding over a five year period. It might be noted that the sensitive program was recognized by the second Masters Coordinator as having to fit in with the other priority areas on the Northern campus: "The problem is to get started without creating conflicts with existing priorities. I think there will be plenty of inputs for growth and development (in the future) without threatening or interfering with other programs."

The same consideration is not evident in locating Masters programs on the Southern campus. In fact, there are numerous examples of requests for rearranging faculty waiting lists for staff apartments on the Southern campus to accommodate visiting Northern counterparts on teaching assignments.

Joint planning seems to be successful when the counterpart departments reach a "critical mass" by assigning similar priorities to the same problem area. The Masters English Department desired to work on student deficiencies and the counterpart faculty were in the process of thinking about a new remedy, as the present remedial system was unsuccessful.

Program-planning centers about a number of distinct areas. There were the numerous student programs mentioned above, which have now been discontinued. The Masters coordinator spends much of his energy devising "curricular experiments" and these have included "A Raisin in the Sun" produced at Masters by the Lewis Theatre Group, Music Department concert exchanges (the Lewis organist had an audience of six because of poor publicity), a research project "Career Preference Analysis" initiated by a Masters sociologist (but not followed through by Lewis because of a lack of research talent in their sociology department), a Social Science Workshop (on the evening of Martin Luther King's assassination), a film society, and a visiting lecturers program, among other projects. Also, there are short summer courses, notably in physics/chemistry. Lewis personnel become involved in the project to further both faculty and staff development, not by in-service training or participation in consortium activities, but by attending conferences, other degree programs, and workshops.

Among the "curricular experiments" are a number of crash programs. They result from the feeling that "one-shot" approaches are inadequate in meeting the problems and extended visits are too costly. Also, there are environmental constraints limiting the duration of interaction on the Southern campus. Thus, a faculty member might go down for four or five days, or for two days on two successive weeks. They amount to injections. A semester teaching assignment with greater potential for long-term benefits was unsuccessful. Without attributing cause and effect, the Masters faculty member was shunned by his Negro colleagues, and he took less than complete interest in his assignment by missing section meetings and becoming a visiting professor at another local college.

There is the hope by Masters personnel that there will be a residual effect, that courses and lectures given by Northern faculty will be taught the following year by their counterparts, or result in greater collaboration. And, in fact, some Lewis people would hope to see fewer trips South and a greater building up of indigenous leadership. But it is difficult to "build up" equals. Pride, the desire for reciprocity, realistic differentials, and the spirit of the Federal funding confound each other.

ROLE BEHAVIOR

In the previous case study, it was pointed out that staff personnel, who score high on security and social needs fulfillment, were more likely than line personnel, who are motivated by autonomy and self-realization fulfillment, to engage voluntarily in cooperative relationships.[9]

The forward-looking Lewis President-elect held an important staff position, was high in his organization's hierarchy, and had the authority to enforce his will. And his attitudes toward the cooperative changed in strength, though not in direction, after he assumed the Presidency and inherited its vested interests.

The Masters and Lewis Presidents, who are on their organization's boundaries, cooperate and interact well. However, a cooperative behavior is also evident along boundary functions of non-boundary personnel.

---

[9] Lyman W. Porter, Organizational Patterns of Managerial Job Attitudes, American Foundation for Management Research, 1964, p. 26.

The Masters Music Department has a close relationship with Lewis counterparts. For the most part, Northern music groups go down to perform. Professional musicians, by definition, briefly enter the boundaries of a person's life-space. In addition, there is a positive transfer of behavioral patterns between what is normally required in their roles and what is required in the cooperative.

College professors have many functions and can perform a variety of activities within the broad framework of the relationship. The majority of interactions occur, however, when Northern faculty give lectures on the Lewis campus. This is not only an attempt to alleviate cultural isolation, gather needed inputs without creating problems from more than peripheral contact, but lecturing is a major boundary function of professors. Consultation for course development, common problem-solving, joint research projects occur infrequently, if at all. Lectures have little lasting impact, and they might be supported by Lewis on that basis, as well as their obvious public relations value; but they also require a role function which by definition is most easily capable of boundary permeation. Once again, there is a positive transfer between the normal role and cooperative role behavioral patterns.

In addition, faculty and staff development projects occur outside the boundaries of the Southern campus; Lewis personnel do not participate in the internal cooperative programs for "up-grading."

COMMITTEES

Masters

It was the desire of both college Presidents that faculty and administrative officers from Masters participate in the program and conceive of Lewis in professional rather than in empathetic terms.

The professional criterion used in the selection of faculty participants was that they represent different academic disciplines. Masters faculty went and still go to Lewis for a variety of reasons: some did it out of friendship to the Coordinator, to radicalize the Negro in the South (a large number of Masters faculty call their counterparts "Uncle Toms"), to change or see the South, to bolster one's self-image (the Messiah complex), and curiosity.

A roster was prepared by the first Masters Coordinator with the names of faculty who might be interested in the Project. He outlined the substantive areas with which each would be competent to deal: "has ideas about using teaching aids, willing to work in the language department, and could be helpful in carrying out closed circuit television experiments." But in addition to professional competencies, each person was identified as having "a personal commitment to increasing educational opportunities," having "a personal commitment to some of the social implications of the project," or having "had teaching experience in the South." Many involved faculty were active in civil-rights movements varying from radical to moderate, and some participated in the project out of guilt for not having had a greater involvement in the Negro struggle.

At present the university-wide "Committee on Committees" chooses members to serve on the project group. By and large, these are people who have worked on curricular projects or whose background suggests an interest--active involvement in civil rights work, experiences in projects to benefit the disadvantaged, or anthropological experience in Africa.

A number of Masters faculty have had experience in teaching at schools, white or black, which are similar to Lewis State College. Some professors have worked in Negro colleges and can easily identify with their Southern counterparts. One faculty member, the chairman of the Masters committee, has done his schooling and has taught at a small teachers college that, like Lewis, was isolated, poor, and had minority groups students who depended on financial aid. He is a teacher primarily and sees a great deal of accomplishment and potential at Lewis. Respect, born of accurate knowledge of the handicaps and achievements, strengthens the commitment of certain Northern faculty. It produces as great and as sustained an input of energy as the strong feelings of empathy from others. But, in addition, it produces a greater respect in return from the Southern campus. Exline's finding seems to be relevant:

> Individuals willing to continue to work with the group on a similar task were more accurate in perceiving the task-oriented behavior of their group than were individuals less willing to work with the group.[10]

They operate within the same paradigm.

---

[10] Ralph Exline, "Group Climate as a Factor in the Relevance and Accuracy of Social Perception," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 55:388.

Lewis

Committee selection and participation by Lewis faculty are the results of holding a major position in the college, such as departmental chairmanship,and for some, their perception of how their particular areas might be strengthened through the relationship.

Some Southern faculty are motivated by the "gadfly" roles in which they perceive themselves. They want "to shake things up" and see the project as an opportunity to fulfill this function. Also, some Lewis faculty are in conflict with their colleagues. In a sense they are isolated. One member has come to the college from outside the state and its social environment, is alienated, and is actively involved in the cooperative. A more pervasive isolation has an opposite effect, however. One Lewis faculty member, not on the committee, lacks acceptance on his campus, is isolated by his peers, and is extremely aggressive and vocal in his non-participation.

Thus, there are two committees, one on each campus, responsible for the Masters-Lewis project.

MEETINGS

Masters

When the first Masters Coordinator was in office, the Northern Project Committee was virtually non-functional. Although this regular faculty committee met three or four times a year, they agreed to the plans of action proposed by the coordinator. It was only upon the change in coordinator that the faculty chairman assumed the decision-making functions.

A typical meeting agenda includes:

I. Review of last year's activities

II. Budget for the current fiscal year
Current student programs
Possible programs under curricular experiments

III. Next year
Reorganization of administrative structure
Program proposals
Guidelines for future planning

A great deal of time is currently being spent in attempting to arrive at reciprocal programs. But for all the energy going into this effort, little seems to be produced.

A serendipitious result of the interaction among Masters faculty is that the teaching staff has learned a great deal about the university in its totality, and it has broadened social acquaintances. In fact, this was also an important result of the initial faculty excursion to the South. One faculty member said communication was established between members of the delegation as a result of the many hours spent arguing, discussing, and planning cooperatively in areas of serious concern removed from direct selfish interests at Masters. "This experience has had a very positive effect on faculty relations on our campus."

Lewis

If the committee at Masters meets relatively seldom, the Lewis group meets even less often: in fact, not more than once or twice a year, if that. The program is run exclusively by the Lewis Coordinator. A standing question of the Masters Coordinator when he talks to faculty at Lewis is if the committee has met; one recent attempt to ask this question was answered before the respondent actually heard the entire query.

Joint Meetings

There are periodic joint meetings, "dramas" as some respondents characterize them. During one of the first, they revised the grading structure for exchange students and considered a number of projects in theater exchange and in the social and natural sciences.

A request for the last joint meeting was made unexpectedly by the Lewis Coordinator. The Masters liaison did not want to bring his committee down without good reason, but the counterpart insisted that the Southern group wanted a joint conference. The Masters Coordinator knew the other committee had not met; and thereupon he agreed to visit the group himself, prepare an agenda with them, and then arrange a meaningful joint session.

He arrived for his meeting, only three or four of the Lewis faculty came, mostly late, and it was obvious that they were out of touch with the project. In order for the Lewis Coordinator "to save face," the Masters liaison explained the progress of the cooperative as a summary report. They did formulate a joint agenda.

The need and agenda for such a joint session was articulated as developing plans for the current academic year, establishing priorities and articulating principles for 1969-70, clarifying the roles of the faculty committees and chairman, generating a sense of involvement and commitment, and expanding basic activities.

The discussions progressed smoothly in the joint two-day session. The problems and objections appeared, however, when Masters faculty visited colleagues on the Lewis campus in an attempt to plan further and to implement new programs.

There are, of course, informal sessions between campus representatives. In short, Northerners are hosted royally if they arrive to "give" a lecture or concert; they are ignored if the purpose is to develop more support. At times the Northern Coordinator schedules meetings with the Lewis President, only to arrive and find the Southern leader out of town for a week. The appointment is probably made without the campus leader's knowledge. In addition, the Northern Coordinator finds it impossible to spend more than a half hour talking with his counterpart during a three day visit; and he is kept waiting two hours in an outer office by another Lewis administrator, only to receive a ten minute "audience."

Trips North are characterized by very full schedules.

FUNCTIONS

REWARDS

Individual

Masters University.--Most of the Masters faculty and administration initiated or continue in the relationship for altruistic motives, or rewards to self-conceptions. Mead suggests two types of role relationships--the economic exchange and the sympathetic religious, or external, orientation.

> The religious attitude...takes you into the immediate inner attitude of the other individual; you are identifying yourself with him insofar as you are assisting him, helping him....your attitude is that of salvation of the individual....The economic process is more superficial and therefore is one which perhaps can travel more rapidly and make possible an easier communication...(A religious communication) is seen when we carry the economic process beyond the profit motive

> over into public-service concerns....(Furthermore), in order to be in sympathy with someone, there must be a response which answers....If there is not a response which so answers, then one cannot arouse sympathy in himself.[11]

Masters' religious motivation and Lewis' pride reduce the thrust for further altruism.

There are some other forces which work against a singularly external or public service orientation. First, individuals can expend just so much time and energy altruistically before the costs of involvement are taken into consideration. Second, there seems to be a "universal law" which makes "reciprocation" a necessary concomitant of "giving." Blau suggests that unilateralism establishes dependency from and power over alter.[12] Mauss says:

> To give is to show one's superiority, to show that one is something more and higher, that one is magister. To accept without returning or repaying more is to face subordination, to become a client and subservient, to become minister.[13]

The general inability of Lewis to reciprocate is at the core of the ill feelings that exist on the Southern campus with respect to the "cooperative." Many Lewis faculty reacted in terms similar to this one official: "The great teachers from Masters want to come here and show you how to do it, and you do not have anything to give in return." There are some Southerners who feel that the differences between the two institutions are so great as not to allow "exchanges," but many on both campuses do search for ways in which they can be of service to each other.

---

[11] George H. Mead, Mind, Self, and Society, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1934, pp. 296-300.

[12] Peter M. Blau, Exchange and Power in Social Life, John Wiley, New York, 1964.

[13] Marcel Mauss, The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies, W. W. Norton, New York, 1967, p. 72.

In short, it seems that cooperation is strengthened when the protagonists act with enlightened self-interest, when in the terms of Whyte and Williams, "social conscience and economics have a joint payoff."[14]

Masters staff and faculty have the "social conscience" and the Federal grant supplies the "economics." For some few, the achievements of their counterparts have supplied enough sustenance; but for others, daily consultant fees had to be initiated in order to maintain their human concern.

There is the understanding that faculty perform university-related functions without additional pay. However, the Northern coordinator was finding it increasingly difficult to attract faculty to work on the program. He then paid the "consultants" $50 per day plus expenses for visits and time spent writing reports and evaluations. Some individuals' fees totalled $1,000 to $1,500 for project involvement. The Masters administration had not been informed of these expenditures and demanded an account when it came to their attention. As a result of the meeting, the fees continued but were taken from a different fund.

This procedure for motivating a semi-latent social concern was learned by a number of Lewis faculty who too desired to receive the

---

14. William F. Whyte and L. K. Williams, Toward an Integrated Theory of Development: Economic and Non-Economic Variables in Rural Development, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Ithaca, New York, 1968, p. 48.

consultants' fees when they travelled North. The Lewis coordinator, however, refused to follow his counterpart's strategy resulting in a lessened desire by Southern faculty to travel North. It was not a matter of economics, but pride in desiring to be treated like their Northern counterparts.

Masters University is heavily oriented to research and time devoted to the cooperative does take away from faculty involvement with their traditional functions. A number of involved faculty were senior personnel, so questions of tenure were inapplicable. Also, the time commitments needed were not so great as to preclude some involvement. However, a number of faculty were aware that the University's payoff structure did not give high priority to working in the Project. The institution placed research, teaching, and community service in that order, with the latter having significance only if a person were "borderline" on the other two.

In order to motivate faculty to continue working on the Project, some administrators persuaded the Academic Vice-President to inform faculty that participation would be looked upon favorably for pay increases and tenure. However, a research university is not a monolithic structure. At least one departmental chairman prevented his faculty from initiating projects, in spite of their interests, because he wanted research output. It was only when the chairmanship changed that the department initiated proposals for involvement.

Lewis.--Lewis faculty, as individuals, do gain a great deal from the projects. Up to twenty individuals each year are granted fellowships to initiate or continue doctoral studies, attend summer workshops or short courses, and attend conventions.

Also, the Southern Coordinator is rewarded with a great deal of power in deciding the distribution of the funds.

Organizational

Masters.--One of the more significant rewards accruing to Masters University is the public relations potential of the cooperative. Whether the program is used as a justification for not committing greater resources to projects for the disadvantaged or for image producing news releases, the cooperative is visable to legislators and students alike.

In addition, one of the initial objectives was to learn about working with disadvantaged students. It is questionable whether the environmental and scholastic differences between Northern and Southern Negroes do not considerably reduce this transfer potential, but the Masters disadvantaged program has been funded, in part, with monies coming from the Project. In 1967, 90% of the Coordinator's salary was derived from the cooperative, and in 1968 the change in locus of administrative headquarters to the South resulted in a drop to 30%. However, neither 30% nor 90% of the Coordinator's time was ever spent on the Project, but helped pay for his other functions as an academic counselor and director of the disadvantaged program, and helped pay for the latter program's operation.

There are few other potential rewards or payoffs to Masters. There is the possibility that greenhouse material for biology laboratories might be exchanged. The heterogeneous environments produce different flora, which if exchanged, would save money and provide richer learning experiences.

In the previous case study it was maintained that the reward function operated optimally when there was a heterogeneity in the motivations, goals, perspectives, and strengths of the involved institutions. The Masters-Lewis Project underlines the assumption that in addition to heterogeneity, there must be something to exchange. Exchanges are based on institutional strengths: a member of the biology department comes North to demonstrate a rare skill, an excellent Lewis greenhouse provides plant materials. But, in all, Masters has many strengths and Lewis few.

Lewis.--According to the Federal regulations, cooperative arrangements may include, among others, joint planning, visiting scholars, student and faculty exchanges, faculty and administration improvement programs, and joint use of facilities and faculties. Lewis administration has emphasized the reward over the problem-solving potentialities of the legislation.

A typical response by Lewis personnel is that "a lot is going on under the money, without it we would really hurt." Lewis gained a number of inputs: visiting lecturers (115 in 1967-68), faculty and staff fellowships, and non-project related items, to mention only a few. These programs are easily arranged, usually without consultation with the Northern counterparts. The point is that Lewis could accomplish its main aims by utilizing the money from the project without being in a cooperative relationship with a specific institution. The cooperating university is necessary only in order for Lewis to be awarded the Federal grant. If consultants from major universities were needed by the College, they could be retained in the normal manner.

Frustrations and delays occur when there is an attempt by Masters to attack some problem at Lewis. Actually, many of the curricular programs are carried by Lewis to justify the grant. They find themselves "on the spot" and need to agree to some joint effort occasionally to keep Masters and the relationship intact for the considerable funds its brings in annually.

Costs

There are costs as well as rewards related to the Masters-Lewis Project. There is a great expenditure of energy, time, and money with a questionable amount of output. Without questioning the value of short-term programs or the influence of visiting lecturers, the planning process has a heavy human and financial cost when, for instance, after two weeks of planning among eight people, the Lewis faculty do not attend a program for their benefit; or after planning a trip by a Masters faculty member, he forgets to notify his Southern hosts that he is too busy to attend the class and the assembled group waits for his appearance; or four or five students attend a physics seminar that cost six faculty members two days each.

In many areas, changes would require more inputs than are practical. It might take five years to bring a Lewis music student up to her Northern counterpart. And even if possible, long-term plans are difficult to arrange because of the uncertain funding situation.

Each college contributes services to the project. Masters will contribute $130,000 and Lewis $40,000 in kind during the period 1966-71 when the five year effort terminates.

PROBLEM-SOLVING

The second major purpose or function of the Federal legislation and of the bilateral is in problem-solving. Although the original objectives considered problem areas at Masters, such as better utilization of television, the focal organization for problem-solving was Lewis.

Faculty and staff travelled South to identify curricular areas needing help and then worked with their counterparts in devising courses, workshops, or seminars to alleviate the weaknesses. The most successful and long-lived programs are in three areas: music, language arts, chemistry-physics; and new programs are beginning in biology.

Masters professors of music not only give concerts, but hold workshops and give lectures; the joint English faculties planned a tutorial program in the fundamentals of writing; and upperclass chemistry-physics courses were given. In planning these joint ventures, the actors at Lewis were forward-looking, but all of the discipline areas have an important property in common--they are highly paradigmatic. A paradigm is a model or theoretical framework by which fact collection and theory articulation become highly directed activities. It defines the group as well as the problem.[15]

Following the joint planning sessions to determine the nature of an English tutorial program, a Masters faculty member reported an episode which indicated "the harmony and closeness of agreement of (the) proceedings."

---

[15] Thomas S. Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.

> In one of our last sessions I distributed to the entire group duplicate copies of student papers I had selected from a set given to me by [a Lewis faculty member]. (He himself had not yet corrected them.) I asked the group to rank these papers, from best to worst, and briefly indicate the strengths and weaknesses of each paper. Each person in the group did so without consultation with any other member. We found, when we compared our conclusions, that eight of us--the six instructors from Lewis and two from Masters were in PERFECT agreement. We had all ranked exactly the same papers in the same order, for the same reasons.

Similarly in music, the notes are dictated by the composer, and technique, which can be highly personalized, can also deal with the fundamentals. Said one Masters' music professor, "I don't tell the student she is wrong, Beethoven does."

"In physics," said a spokesman for the last curricular effort, "one is not original." The lectures and courses supplied by Masters faculty are objective needs given the state of the scientific disciplines.

Joint planning in the social sciences has been considerably more difficult. However, Masters and Lewis counterparts did jointly plan an interdisciplinary course in the social sciences, with the Northern campus serving a very useful function.

The first Masters coordinator and the Lewis Dean of Instruction were close and evidently they colluded in bringing change to the Southern campus by "using" Masters resources in controversial areas.

The Lewis Dean and some faculty wanted to establish an interdisciplinary course but this caused significant internal dissension on the campus. Many faculty did not want to teach "watered down courses," but elected to teach in their specialties.

A Masters faculty member experienced in interdisciplinary courses was brought down as a consultant and was asked to assess the resident faculty's attitudes toward the suggested course. Although the faculty had been verbal about their feelings previously, the Masters social scientist, unknowingly, supplied the Dean of Instruction with sensitive information that enabled him to choose more accurately those who should work on the new project.

A group of Lewis faculty was assembled to devise a new program, did some preliminary work at Lewis, but travelled to Masters to consult and finish the planning. The new course was stencilled at Masters but mimeographed back home.

Similarly, the English tutorial planning group went North to escape pressures and to perceive things in perspective.

Thus, Masters has served as an innovative device by providing facilities and personnel for Lewis administrators and faculty to negotiate the changes they wish to make on their campus.

It was mentioned, when discussing the individual institutions, that the cooperating colleges have different functions--one is developing toward a research center and the other is responsible for training teachers who will then go into Southern public school systems. This heterogeneity is dysfunctional for solving problems; the institutions have different research and curricular aims. Standard remarks by Lewis faculty are that "Masters must know its audience down here." "Masters professors go under or over student expectations." "We are in the business of training teachers."

Lack of homogeneity in quality also has important repercussions. Some Masters people feel that they cannot "go down that low" in teaching the Lewis undergraduates. "They have never worked with this kind of student, they do not know how, and they are unable to do it."

A greater degree of homogeneity would be functional for problem-solving.

CHAPTER VI

THREE CASE STUDIES

INTRODUCTION

The consortia in the previous two case studies were investigated intensively over a five month period. The inter-organizational relationships described in this chapter were studied for a period of one to two weeks each to determine if the informal hypotheses suggested by the previous intensive analyses could be clarified further through observations in different structural relationships. It was also hoped that these shorter studies would raise new issues and direct attention to administrative problems and solutions as yet undescribed.

SECTION ONE

THE ST. THOMAS UNIVERSITY-SACRED COLLEGE COOPERATIVE

St. Thomas University and Sacred College are two Catholic institutions of higher education located within twenty-five miles of each other in the Northeastern United States. Since Summer 1960 they have cooperated in a joint graduate degree program which since its inception has provided over 120 courses for 1,500 students at Sacred as well as the opportunity for sisters and the lay community to proceed with a masters program. In this effort, economics and social consciousness have had a joint payoff.

ENVIRONMENT, BACKGROUND, PERSONNEL

As will be explained below, the conditions for cooperation were provided by a growing inhospitable social environment in which these institutions found themselves as well as the bilateral's ability to meet the complementary needs of the members.

The region of the state in which this bilateral is located has had a tradition of independent colleges serving regional educational needs. However, toward the latter part of the 1950's there were advances by the area state-related institution to initiate a large enterprise in the region. The impending crisis was met by the advanced planning of the independent schools, but only through the long-range perspective provided by a Jesuit priest who was serving as Dean of the Graduate School at St. Thomas.

The Dean had recently returned to St. Thomas, having taught there in the 1940's, from a large Catholic institution in Washington. He was shocked, upon his return, in observing the provincialism and crisis planning in the administration of the local institutions and how great their departure from the mainstream of American higher education. Externally oriented to the experiences provided by the Washington institution and, unlike his colleagues, cognizant of the threat of the state-related university, he succeeded in organizing a consortium of the seven local independent colleges. This Association, based on the survival needs of the institutions, provided the groundwork for the bilateral between two of the members for a joint graduate program.

The Jesuit priest was concerned about the future of the other independent educational institutions who "sowed the seed when the soil was less fertile and other educational resources non-extant" because the future of his college was bound up with the health of the others. But the negative defensive rationale for the Association was balanced with a more aggressive tactic of attempting to force out the large universities' extension courses that were located in the region, while at the same time building up the graduate program at St. Thomas which was his official responsibility.

After weathering the advances of the large tax-supported institution, he consulted with Association members about participating in a joint graduate program; and he achieved little initial success: some feared domination by this, the largest of the member colleges, one already had a cooperative program, another did not want to change its charter to accommodate the new relationship. In fact, the President of St. Thomas was opposed, believing that "expansion" would cost too much.

However, complementary rewards were identified by Sacred College; and the program has provided "payoffs" for both institutions, the lay community, and the religious orders involved.

THE PROGRAM

Representatives from St. Thomas, a multi-purpose men's university, and Sacred College, a women's college and religious motherhouse, agreed that the former institution should provide a partial masters program on the latter's campus. Students can take fifteen hours of course work at Sacred but must take the remaining fifteen hours at St. Thomas in order to receive a masters degree in the fields of American history, English, or education.

The College decides what courses it desires, hires the instructors who usually come from their regular staff, and receives the tuition which is allocated to faculty salaries and additional library expenses. The College makes little monetary profit on the program.

The University, on the other hand, has complete control over academic quality and administrative procedures. St. Thomas retains all records, controls all admissions, governs the syllabi and texts for the courses which are identical to those used at the University, supervises the program and provides faculty chairmen or mentors to the sisters and lay personnel who take the courses. Program faculty travel to St. Thomas periodically to consult with the resident professors giving the same courses. In brief, the part-time professors have no option of teaching a course that might differ from what is normally given.

Sacred's personnel do not object to this arrangement. They realize that they do not have the expertise to administer a graduate program and recognize that St. Thomas resources maintain the cooperative. It should be noted also that "authority" is acceptable given the conditions of the Church.

Since the program's inception approximately 120 courses have been given to 1,500 students, more courses being given during the summer session than in the two regular terms combined, with two-thirds of the students taking courses during the summer months. There is an average of nine students per course during the academic year and seventeen per course during the summer.

The courses achieving the highest subscription are in the area of education. Twenty-four different courses, taught on many occasions, are given in that field as compared to eight in English and nine in American history. If a course is undersubscribed, Sacred College has the option of dropping it and has exercised that privilege nineteen times. It receives the profits, but it must also accommodate the financial losses.

The remaining fifteen credits for the masters degree are taken at St. Thomas as part of their regular evening and summer graduate offerings.

FUNCTIONS

Problem-Solving

Initially, a joint committee composed of the Dean and one faculty member from each college provided liaison and had the decision-making power for the program. Over the years the Deans have remained involved but the faculty rotate and include the chairmen of those areas that are affected by the agenda.

The academic areas that are involved in the program are based on the strengths and desired strengths of the curricula of the member schools. Both institutions, which train public and parochial school teachers, have homogeneous sub-purposes requiring similar curricula.

The majority of faculty in the program at Sacred are that institution's regular staff. Its provisions of faculty points to the homogeneity of the graduate offerings to the undergraduate curriculum and to the similar areas given at both member institutions for the same purpose--to train teachers.

The academic areas offered by St. Thomas are among the strongest that institution has. Sacred, on the other hand, committed itself to building up its library resources in the areas covered by the new program. It had to recognize a need to expend very scarce resources and did so to support their regular academic as well as the graduate courses.

It might be noted that to avoid competition, St. Thomas does not offer the same courses on its campus at the same time as they are given at Sacred College, unless a large number of students is expected.

Homogeneity of organizational goals and the mechanisms for achieving them aid the problem-solving functions of this bilateral.

Rewards

Both institutions shared a common need to maintain what one individual called "squatter's rights" in the region, which could be strengthened by meeting and cultivating local educational needs without outside support. In addition to this shared objective, each college hoped to achieve very different rewards.

Sacred College.--Through participation in this bilateral, Sacred College is able to build up its summer session enrollment, provide teaching outlets for creative faculty members, give a heightened academic aura to the campus, promote relations with the surrounding community by opening the courses to lay personnel, and allow sisters to work at the College while doing masters work.

The program also furthered the Sisters Formation Movement which Hassenger says is probably most responsible for the changes occurring in Catholic women's colleges. This movement began in the 1950's and attempted to replace "blue-apron mysticism"--the judgment of religious zeal in terms of housework--with professional preparation in the sisters various fields of endeavor. More sisters went on for doctorates and it led to more emphasis on rational authority rather than blind obedience.[1]

The Jesuit priest emphasized the meaning of this Movement when he was persuading Sacred College to enter the relationship. He indicated that graduate training would insure "fully trained, completely competent, intellectually alert, academically-oriented religious teachers in every classroom."

Furthermore, since courses are given at Sacred and sisters are housed in the order's facilities available in the city where the university is located, costs for graduate education are low. The College only has $12,000 yearly to spend on the graduate education of sisters, which can support a large number of program participants but few students travelling to distant graduate centers.

St. Thomas University.--St. Thomas also achieved a great number of goals. It built up its graduate school by attracting the sisters and the lay public to finish masters programs begun at Sacred College; it built up its prestige in a different locale; it liquidated other universities' extension centers and created a monopoly for itself; it augments the academic tone of the University since sisters are good students; and it allows the University to be of service which the initiator feels is of intrinsic benefit.

---

[1] Robert Hassenger, "The Future Shape of Catholic Higher Education," in R. Hassenger, ed., The Shape of Catholic Higher Education, University of Chicago Press, 1967, pp. 311-312.

Other Benefits

St. Thomas sees itself as saving resources for the Church; preventing Catholics from being forced to attend non-church related colleges; providing better trained teachers for the parochial schools, allowing them to better compete with public institutions; and providing earlier training for sisters thus insuring greater service to the Church and greater profit-making potential to the religious order.

The colleges and the communities have a variety of important rewards. The program, in providing complementary benefits, insures cooperation without conflict. The initiator feels that voluntary cooperatives are "like walking on egg-shells": one false move and the relationship can be destroyed. The viability of this voluntary bilateral is stronger than most because of the unequal inputs from each college, common sub-goals which provide a base for mutual problem-solving, and different but complementary reward structures which prevent competition for the joint gain.

PSYCHOLOGICAL COOPERATION

Even though this bilateral is labelled a "cooperative," it is, in fact, a St. Thomas extension program which relieves them of cost and provides multiple rewards.

The term "extension" is not used because it has a pejorative connotation, and it "would detract from Sacred College's status as an independent institution (and) indicate...we were using them." Since the word "cooperation" seems more dignified and ennobling to both participants, that terminology is employed.

Although many of the courses given at Sacred would require extra sections if taught at St. Thomas, the women's college does not perceive domination or "being used." The College's Dean of Graduate Studies feels that St. Thomas does not impose its will; it listens, with favorable response, to her requests. And if St. Thomas gains a great deal, they also take responsibility for the academic program.

St. Thomas personnel attempt to maintain the aura of equitability by accommodating Sacred's requests and by "going out of their way" for their colleagues, as exampled by travelling to their campus for intercollegiate meetings.

Thus, potential problems created by inequalities are balanced by the sizable advantages accruing to the sister institution as well as explicit attempts to create psychological equality.

SECTION TWO

THE UNIVERSITY CENTER

The preceding case study indicates that "economics and social conscience have a joint payoff," that a combined "internal" and "external" orientation by the protagonist can lead to a smoothly functioning cooperative.

The second short case study focuses on different issues: the roles of the Director, the community members, and the college faculties and administrators; the effect on interaction resulting from differences among the institutions; the problem of balancing costs and benefits; and the impact of the environment.

Each of these issues has parallels in the preceding cases, and the theoretical impact of the similarities and differences will be discussed in the next chapter.

BACKGROUND, PURPOSES

A number of higher educational organizations were conducting extension courses during the 1950's in a state capital which lacked its own college. To reduce costs and competition and better service the region, the presidents of two small local colleges joined their extension efforts in 1951. They persuaded a large private university to affiliate in 1954 and induced a prestigious private university and a large state university to join in 1957.

The five institutions--two small, local, religiously oriented liberal arts colleges and three large universities located around a ninety mile radius of the capital--incorporated in 1958 with the following rationale and purpose:

> The rapid growth of our population with its related increase of high school graduates makes the continuation of education an imperative for an ever increasing number of persons as an essential condition for the preservation of the basic values of our free society....
>
> We, being citizens of a metropolitan community in Central ___(State)___, desirous of meeting the great challenge of our times, hereby join together in a free and voluntary association to assist in providing the needs for increased and expanded educational opportunities through a combination of inter-institutional and community efforts, facilities, and resources.

Operationally, this meant the establishment of a non-profit corporation to administer undergraduate courses which could be applied to full-time programs on the members' campuses, masters programs, and informal adult education extension courses.

A general profile of the student body of the University Center (1,306 in Spring 1968) indicates: 55% between 24 and 30 years of age, 67% married, 29% employed in "education," 70% having at least one year of college experience, and 46% having a college degree.

GOVERNANCE

College : Community

The University Center has both institutional and community members on a variety of boards.

There are thirty community members, outstanding business and civic leaders, on a self-perpetuating Board. Fifteen from this group are selected by a nominating committee composed of institutional and local leaders, to serve on the Board of Directors which has an equal number of college representatives, three from each institution. The community group is largely an honorary body and few "leaders," however enthusiastic, take an active interest in the Center, except for the Corporation President, Vice President, and Treasurer who come from that source.

The Board of Directors is a "rubber stamp" for the Executive Committee of the Board which makes the important decisions and which consists of five institutional and four community members. It is chaired traditionally, by a president of one of the small local colleges. Fewer community members insures their lack of control over the academic programs, although there presently is an attempt to involve them more fully in policy decisions. However, the community members have no investment and lack an active commitment.

In addition to the above-mentioned boards, there are four operating committees. The most influential, chaired by college representatives, is the Administrative and Curriculum Committee which decides on programs. It has a preponderance of college representatives who are the institutions' extension education officers. These men from the major universities also serve as alternates to their institutional presidents and speak for their colleges, with the presidents of the local institutions, at Board meetings. The curriculum committee might discuss new courses, the future direction of the Center, the student survey, or the findings of its library sub-committee. The other committees, two of which are chaired by community members, deal with budget and finance, public relations, and buildings and grounds.

The Director

The Center's Director, a former professor at one of the local institutions, came to that position after the "selection committee" on which he served had difficulty employing an "academically respectable outsider." The colleges give little autonomy to the Center Director, except to initiate recommendations for courses. The Director is perceived as an executive secretary, to direct affairs in accordance with Board policy, to register and counsel students, and to supervise the instructors. He has many duties, but can exercise little authority.

The Director is satisfied with these responsibilities and perceives his role as "keeping the schools happy." He does not attempt to gain greater decision-making powers, or experiment with new ideas. He perceives the position as a step up from his teaching role and is obviously attempting to live according to his recent improvement in status.

He is internally and centrally motivated for personal gain while the colleges are peripherally and internally oriented for their benefits.

PROGRAM

An early and most difficult cooperative action taken by the institutional presidents was to agree on a common tuition policy. The private institutions lowered and the public colleges raised their undergraduate and graduate charges to achieve commonality, which was recognized as a prerequisite to a combined program. Initially, the colleges registered their students separately, but large enrollments created a chaotic situation leading to a joint registration procedure.

It was also decided that undergraduate courses given by any of the institutions in the Center would be transferable if a student wanted to continue his studies in residence at one of the colleges. The faculty at one of the large universities was hostile to this agreement because of perceived differences in quality among the member colleges, and the issue had to be decided by top level administration. Recently, however, some colleges have balked at accepting the "D" grade, although originally agreed to by the representatives.

The courses cover a wide range of disciplines and are identical to those taught at the member institutions. The courses appearing in the consortium catalog have the same numbers and descriptions as those which appear in the home catalogs but are not explicitly identified as a specific institution's offerings to give the appearance of unity.

Unlike the undergraduate courses given by the two local colleges and one university, only the universities offer graduate work. Each institution selects its own graduate students, and credits are not transferable. Although some graduate programs are given wholly at the Center, many require the student to be in residence at one of the three universities in order for him to obtain the degree.

PRESTIGE AND IMAGE

There are great qualitative and quantitative differentials among the five member institutions. At first, the faculty from one prestige university did not wish to accept the credits from the other institutions, and each wished to maintain its identity.

Explicit prestige differentials are not apparent in the interaction among members today. To a large extent this is the result of the decision that each college provide courses based on its "competencies, specialties, and interests." Each institution provides particular undergraduate disciplines or graduate programs.

In addition, the small colleges provide the leadership on the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors. These local institutions have the responsibility for providing services to local constituents, are located close to the Center to oversee administrative details, and have fewer commitments and interests than the large universities which allow more time to be spent on Center affairs. However, there are implicit prestige differentials assumed by the large universities who take a "statesman" role by encouraging the local colleges to take leadership positions. The image is created of the larger schools "mothering" the less affluent, a position taken for the consumption of the state legislature, and one which many observers feel is unrepresentative of the rapacious natures of these big institutions.

"Image" is responsible for a current problem--high costs. A campus valued at $850,000, formerly a naval reserve center, was acquired without charge from the U.S. Government, to give an aura of respectability to the undertaking which had been formerly housed in rented high school space. The property's maintenance expenses have increased the Center's budget by one-third which, with declining enrollments, has presented the members with expenses about which they are now complaining.

Extension programs do not have a great deal of respectability in academia among the resident faculty who teach some of the courses, and this has jeopardized support from that quarter.

NEW PURPOSE

Center members have been debating about a redefinition of purpose for the operation during the past two years. Environmental constraints, and the interests of the community members and the colleges are central to this problem.

Environmental Constraints

The major universities entered the cooperative because they wanted to display their service function in the state capital, in order to increase their large subsidies from the government. Location in the capital prevents outbreaks of conflict among the institutions which are self-oriented and prevents the colleges from disaffiliating although some would welcome the opportunity to leave, because of financial costs.

But no one wants to be the first to withdraw and possibly receive "bad press."

The Center did have a great deal of negative publicity a few years ago when it was in competition with a new community college for its present campus which it received gratis as a result of political contacts in Washington. The Center once gave the equivalent of the first two years of college, a function that was pre-empted by the community college, and it was accused of "profiteering"--an image that it is still attempting to destroy.

In addition, one member university, one of the most organizationally aggressive in the state, established a branch campus only ten miles from the Center for senior level undergraduate and for graduate courses. The university shifted some of its Center courses there, and has established programs in competition with others given by member institutions.

Both the community college and the branch campus have curtailed enrollment at the Center and will have agreater impact if and when they expand the new campus programs in the future, which seems likely.

Thus, the higher costs of maintaining a campus, coincided with lower enrollments and institutional deficits. For example, 4,239 students were enrolled in 1965, 4,189 in 1966, 3,876 in 1967, and current figures show a still further reduction. The colleges receive the tuition for their courses but pay a percentage of the Center's budget based upon their portions of the total income. However, the budget jumped from $63,000 in 1966 to $96,500 one year later. And the colleges are declaring deficits based on budget percentages, salary and travel expenses for faculty, and administrative overhead. The combined losses were $19,000 in 1966 and $54,000 in 1967.

Community Members

The community members, realizing this lack of purpose, commissioned two studies to determine a redefinition for future operations. The first consultant recommended a heavy emphasis on adult education courses with a technical, professional flavor. However, those courses instituted have not been popularly accepted by the citizenry. The most recent consultant was asked to research the community members' desire for a full bacallaureate program to be provided at the Center, which would be the only one in the large urban community. In spite of the consultant's negative reaction, based upon the heavy costs and the uncertain need, the community leaders "want their own college," and some envision a multiversity sprouting from this humble beginning.

The Colleges

The universities are peripherally involved, and they have a tradition of faculty control. The extension representatives do not believe that their faculties would approve their institutions offering a degree program on the basis of combined courses from the member institutions, without residence requirements. Thus, university representatives look to the local institutions who are more centrally related to the environment and who have stronger administrative, rather than faculty, leadership for initiative on this issue. In fact, the local college with a stronger administration than its neighboring sister institution is the one that is presently considering this issue of a bacallaureate program. However, this sympathetic college is somewhat negatively oriented because of the anticipated costs and the academic and fund raising problems it may create for itself.

The colleges are unwilling to enter more centrally into the relationship without large-scale community backing, and the community members plead an inability to raise funds without a creative plan sponsored by the colleges--such as a bacallaureate program. A stalemate has resulted.

Neither the community at large, nor the community members have contributed more than token money in the past; and with declining enrollments, the service orientation of some and the state capital location are the prime, but eroding rationales for continued involvement.

FUNCTIONS

Problem-Solving

The preceding discussion of re-definition points to the different or heterogeneous attitudes held by the community members and the college representatives as to the proposed goals of the enterprise. One perceives a full-fledged college and the other desires a relationship with continued involvement based on cost and benefit factors. There are homogeneous attitudes within each group.

Problem-solving is seriously hindered because of the lack of understanding each segment has of the others goals, commitments, and constraints. Communication is difficult. The community members cannot understand why the colleges complain about a few thousand dollars loss which can be recouped elsewhere, why full-time faculty would not flock to the Center, why "residence" is important, or why the public library might be inadequate in serving as the Center's facility. And the colleges cannot understand why the community members do not comprehend their "truth."

Rewards

The colleges entered the Center because the rewards of giving extension courses would be greater in a cooperative. The institutions do not compete: each one provides different courses. In addition to the $300,000 yearly revenue, there is the desire to be in the state legislature's graces for fund-raising purposes.

The small local colleges gain the "lion's share" of the income--over $160,000 yearly. They hope their involvement will result in easier fund-raising, and they do have a service function to perform for their constituency.

The schools also use the Center as an outlet for completing professors' course requirements if they cannot be met on the campus, provide overload earnings for the teaching staffs, and for some institutions, provide a place for students to complete the first two years of college with future transfer possibilities to the main campuses.

One institutional representative indicated that in the past "we did do more, we were making more" ($30,000-$6,000). As the costs climb and the deficits increase, the colleges contemplate abandoning the Center and refuse to seriously consider more significant involvement unless massive financial support from the community persuades them to reconsider.

SECTION THREE

THE INSTITUTE FOR URBAN EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS

The Institute for Urban Educational Problems was formed as a separate, independent, non-profit agency by six institutions of higher education (later expanded to eight) in one large urban area. Although a separate entity, it had an initial responsibility to work in conjunction with its founding institutions. The relevance of this case study is to portray the forces pushing toward and working against inter-institutional efforts.

TOWARD A CONSORTIUM

During 1962-1963, a number of educational agencies in the state proposed forming an institute to deal with urban educational problems. The convergence or critical mass was formed after Federal government representatives suggested that a consortium would receive priority for funding purposes. Under the leadership of one university president, a proposal transmitted by five colleagues in different colleges and submitted by the State Education Department in December 1964 did receive funds for research and development.

The proposed initial objectives and activities were:

> Objectives:
>
> The Institute for Urban Educational Problems is intended to associate in a single institution scholars and educators concerned with problems of urban education, for the purpose of conducting research and development programs, and of disseminating the results of their investigation and information on their development activities. The Institute will utilize the services of faculty from the founding institutions, which comprise among themselves a major part of the

> applicable scholarly resources to be found in (the city); the Institute will also be designed to attract scholars and educators from outside the city. One of its principle objectives will be the recruitment of added talent to research and development work in urban education.
>
> Activities:
>
> The Institute will conduct basic and applied research in problems of urban education including intellective development, staffing, institutional arrangements, pre-school instruction, organization including problems of integration, sociology and the application of technology. The Institute will further work closely with city and suburban school systems to test the results of its research in the schools, and will engage in development and pilot production of materials for use in urban education. It will act as a coordinating agency for activities carried on independently within its founding institutions. The dissemination of information will be one of its principle functions.

The Institute was initially designed to be both an independent laboratory and a consortium. Said one founder:

> The organizational aims of the Institute are to establish a strong central office where research and development projects may be planned and executed, and at the same time to facilitate coordinated R&D activities in the participating institutions by providing a substantial, relevant support structure composed of personnel and equipment.

In addition, the consortium planned to direct the Institute.

The original by-laws created a Board of Trustees composed of institutional representatives, mainly university presidents, who did want their respective institutions to gain from the relationship. Although one representative withdrew because his "pet project" was not funded within the context of the Institute, the Board has been able to transcend the individual members' goals for reasons to be mentioned.

The by-laws also instituted a planning committee, composed of one faculty member from each institution and also initially a part of the Board of Trustees; and its responsibility was the formulation and direction of programs.

This planning group, with representatives from diverse colleges which already had unique urban educational projects, was very conflict laden. The committee found it difficult to transcend institutional roles and needs and to plan comprehensively. It saw the Institute as a holding company for funds and was disbanded by the Board of Trustees, upon the recommendation of the Institute Director, as a result of the turmoil it produced.

If the planning committee provided heat, the initial steering committees provided the confusion. As the proposed activities indicate, the Institute was planning to include research activities in a number of areas. To fulfill the needs of the eight colleges and the talents and interests of the ninety-two faculty members who could participate in Institute-related activities, seven steering committees attempted to investigate different realms of urban education: policy problems in educational systems, intellective development: cognitive psychology, curriculum and instructional materials, staff development, special education, employment opportunities and education, and administration.

Not only was there a diversity in subject areas, but each committee used different methodologies in dealing with its sphere: some listed major questions to be asked, others wrote research proposals. And it was with the greatest difficulty that the Director provided "umbrellas" to accommodate the output.

PERSONNEL

The Institute for Urban Educational Problems was formed to fulfill an important social purpose and was guaranteed funds if the local colleges joined forces. The Institute also easily attracted a capable staff both because of the exciting purposes of the new venture and because Institute staff were encouraged to be on the faculties of the member colleges. But there were different interests or motivations for joining: the "scholars" came for research, the "educators" for missionary type development, and the "activists" for change. In fact, originally the scholars and educators were placed on separate research and development committees with less than adequate interchange between them.

The Institute demanded and attracted individuals who, in the words of one, were "consorting types." The initiating college president had scientific consortium experience, state educational department personnel were responsible for all education in their jurisdiction, Federal government and foundation officials had overviews and experience in bringing new programs and structures into being, and one educator had an educational consortium background. These individuals believed in and had experience in merging talent before applying their skills in this Institute. However, they failed in the case under study.

AWAY FROM THE CONSORTIUM

There are numerous factors that led to the dissolution of the consortium plan.

The first deputy director, later to become Director, maintains the existentialist position that a man is what he does. He wants to produce and production, in his terms, does not occur when elitests join forces and talk, but when staff and practitioners work together to create some output. The Director could more easily enforce his view, which conflicted with those of many other initial participants because he was a full-time employee, as compared with the peripheral involvement of many others; his official position; and because he transferred his Urban Center from one of the member colleges to the Institute. Not only was a functioning precedent established with his Center, he also brought many of his former staff with him and created, in fact, "a center within a center."

As was mentioned earlier, the planning committees created conflict and chaos and the Board of Trustees realized that some focusing had to occur. If shared objectives did not exist on an operational level, order would have to be imposed. Interestingly, one of the first organizational elements that realized this lack of focus was the Communications Resources Unit responsible for publicizing activities to an external audience and unable to write a coherent article.

The Trustees gave the Director more support and he, through innumerable reorganizations, refocused and continually narrowed the goals of the Institute to a point where only the commitment to urban education remains.

The Institute was initially funded by the Federal government with research and development money, but it became a regional laboratory in the 1966 fiscal year, bringing other forces into play which led to a lessened involvement with the founding institutions.[2] The regional labs were new, large scale, politically motivated ventures that were hastily thought out before implementation. This, coupled with turnovers in the Federal agency responsible for the grant, produced a lack of direction giving the Director the opportunity to pursue his goals. It also allowed the Institute to become susceptible to short-term regional rather than research-oriented university demands. The Federal funds were significantly lower than requested and forced a narrowing of focus and abandonment of institutional projects that could not be funded while maintaining a central headquarters which had a mission of its own.

Because of the newness of the Federal program and criticisms of it in Washington, the funding agency hired a consultant who recommended a narrowing of focus to the Board of Trustees, and consultants hired by the Institute made similar recommendations. They also maintained that the state charter was given to individuals qua individuals and not as institutional representatives, legally, if not morally allowing the Institute to lessen consortium obligations.

Administratively, the change of balance was made easier because the Institute's leadership insisted from the outset on a unified budget, and centralized control over the phones, mail, duplicating, typing, and bookkeeping.

---

[2] See Stephen K. Bailey and Edith K. Mosher, ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law, Syracuse University Press, 1968, pp. 56, 170-171, 183, 206-207, for a discussion of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which provided the regional laboratories.

FUNCTIONS

Problem-Solving

The Director of the Institute wrote:

> Essential to the viability of the Institute is trusting cooperation between member colleges, universities, and school systems. Such cooperation is not new in character, but it is rare. The depth of trust required for effective work by this Institute will be new.

Such trust essential for voluntary joint problem-solving did not exist. There was a great deal of conflict resulting from vested interests, whether institutional or disciplinary. The universities and their faculties had different academic concerns: one focused on teacher training, another on cognitive development of urban youth, another on administrative issues in urban schools, and another on integration and desegregation studies and experiments.

Joint problem-solving was precluded because of the multiple unilateral interests which could not all be supported, the individualistic thrust of the Director, and the regional demands placed against the universities research interests.

There have been major revisions of the Institute's operational goals, although the basic mission to reconstruct urban education remains. Initially, the Institute wanted "to design, disseminate, field test, and institutionalize programs in the elementary schools..." and presently it will "invent, adapt for use, design, field test, and diffuse a coherent series of educational products and services relevant to metropolitan area communities." Initially, focusing occurred according to disciplinary lines so that they would provide paradigms for articulation. The latest major reconstruction paradigm will be provided by the industrial model: it best fits the development thrust of the Director, soon to become President. Staff, which lost all serious research members, will be evaluated on how "effectively productivity is linked more precisely to demand. Demand may have to be cultivated for products that meet needs as yet unacknowledged by practitioners." And it is with pride that a 30% yearly staff turnover is mentioned.

The chart below portrays the Institute's stages of development which were relevant to the goals it set for itself.

	1965	1966-68	1969 (goal)
A. Organizational Structure	Research & Development Center	Regional Center	Industrial
B. Main Goal	Research	Service	Product Development
C. Personnel Evaluation Based On:	Research	Educational Development	Sales
D. Initiators of Purpose	Scholars	Director-Educators	Director-Practitioners
E. Orientation	Founding Universities	Region	National
F. Support	Diversified (seed money)	Federal Government	Diversified
G. Focus	Separate Studies	Output from 6 committees*	Output from 3 Divisions**
H. Size	Less than 20 Permanent Staff	83 Permanent Professionals	76 Permanent Professionals

*E.g., Communications, Educational Personnel, Curriculum Development.

**E.g., Educational Development, Community Development.

The Institute had to face and resolve a number of issues in the process of its development. These have included: defining the operational goals that should guide the enterprise, establishing connections between lines of research and relationships between educational development and action, maintaining its identity, determining relationships with the member colleges, and city, state and Federal agencies, working toward a trustee role for representatives of the individual colleges, and defining the connection between staff members and the Institute.

In brief, the industrial model, which served as the focusing mechanism, has allowed the management's goals to dominate, relationships with other agencies is on a contract basis, clients will more than ever determine what products will be invented, the staff members will neither hold positions in "member" institutions nor be able to bring in funding from outside sources, and the trustees have been legally defined as societal rather than institutional representatives.

Rewards

There were a variety of motivations for institutions joining the consortium. Although some entered because others did, the active representatives combined an external or service orientation with a major interest in the financial rewards that might accrue to them. The reasons for the few hard resources funnelling to the membership were mentioned earlier, but the institutions do benefit in other ways from continued involvement. The Institute sub-contracts with its founders. The Director, unlike most staff members, still teaches at his former university, which actively supports the Institute, and receives major sub-contracts. The founding institutions, which still send representatives to the Board, gain prestige from association with a successful Institute whose future may be brighter, and the show of cooperation does enhance the possibility of new joint programs--and their funds--since ties have already been established.

CHAPTER VII

FIELD WORK IN AN INTER-ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

Chapter III dealt with the methodology of the study. This chapter deals with the dynamics of the interview situation and the problems of conducting field work in an inter-organizational context.

ENTRANCE

Generally, entrance to consortia did not pose serious problems. The first organization, The Association, was contacted by letter and followed up with a visit. The three short studies were chosen from the affirmative responses returned after letters went to eight other voluntary arrangements, some of which were discovered to be non-functional; others did not desire to be studied. However, the writer faced some major problems which have relevance to conducting field work in an inter-organizational context.

The President of the Association gave the author permission to conduct the exploratory study. After being asked if the researcher could send a letter to the Board of Trustees, composed of institutional presidents, the Association President said such action would be unnecessary. "Just tell the Presidents that I approved the study."

The investigator was aware that the relationship between the President and the Board might be less than perfect, but there was little that he could do after being told not to ask explicit permission from the Trustees.

With an initial exception, the investigator contacted the offices of the college presidents a few weeks before desiring to visit the institutions, informed the Presidents or Deans that the study had been approved by the consortium head, and asked permission to come on campus. The acceptances were more or less gracious. The researcher experienced a Dean who felt the investigator was taking too much of his staff's time, but he was speaking for himself rather than for his President who later gave a good interview. The researcher was also refused admittance to the eighth of nine colleges that he planned on visiting. Repeated requests did not persuade the President to alter his original judgment, and the researcher was less direct than he normally would be because he did not want to jeopardize the position of the consortium President.

The Association's President was informed of the researcher's difficulties mentioned above, the latter feeling an obligation to protect the incumbent from bitterness resulting from the study. When the President received an angry call from his trustee who had refused entrance, the researcher was asked rhetorically if he was nearly finished with the study.

Subsequent to the first case, the investigator not only received permission from a central staff, if one existed, but also insured that the study was accepted by all the members of the consortium.

However, the investigator has little doubt that he would not have been admitted to the Association, and the chances for admittance to a multilateral consortium are narrow, if concurrent approvals must come from all the members. No one was thrilled by the investigator's existence on his campus, but accepted the presence as a fait accompli. If the request had gone to the Board, the one strong negative by the institutional president who refused entree might very well have gained the support of the non-committed.

A great deal of difficulty was experienced in entering a bilateral funded under Title III of the 1965 Higher Education Act: at least ten requests for entree met with extremely long delays or no response from both or one of the members. The reason for such difficulty seems to be the sensitivity of the relationship between white and Negro colleges, cooperatives that are delicately balanced and for which institutional heads fear external disturbances.

INTERACTION

There are well-documented accounts of bias resulting from white interviewers conducting research with Negro respondents in an alien environment, which can range from a slum to a Negro college. The researcher feels certain that the color of his skin and his religion affected the interaction between himself and the respondents. Also of import was the general tenseness the researcher felt for the first few days of field work on the Negro college campus, and the fact that he was seen as an "evaluator" regardless of the repeated emphasis that he desired an objective confidential picture of the action for scholarly purposes.

Generally, the researcher found that many who were most affected in the major bilateral and multilateral studies used the interviews for cathartic release. They represented marginal agencies, sustained many frustrations in their work, and hoped the interviewer would solve their basic problems. Although the degree of involvement will be reflected in the amount of information contained by a person, those lesser involved tended to be forthright and to corroborate each other. Their peripheral involvement did not lend itself to giving purposely inaccurate information.

This study found that the "prestige" variable very strongly affected the dynamics of the inter-organizational relationships. It had no less effect on the perceptions interviewees had of the interviewer. He represented "Cornell." Many members in the less prestigious colleges introduced the researcher with pride to their colleagues; and respondents in the better schools felt that, as a member of an equally "high-class" institution, the investigator could recognize how they felt associating with mediocrity. It was only by using open-ended questions that the researcher hoped for objectivity on the respondents' parts.

If "Cornell" helped, then being in the field of education was generally detrimental. Most of the colleges visited were liberal arts institutions, which from random comments, the researcher learned had little respect for "educators." Fortunately, the researcher's background is strong in the sociology of organizations and one purpose of the study is to form hypotheses. The interviewer emphasized his social science background when interacting with those for whom titles were important, but was able to emphasize his education bias when interviewing those in technical or professional fields.

Because of the multiple activities sponsored by the consortia and the large number of staff and faculty who are involved, the researcher selected representative activities, but concentrated on interviewing all of their participants. It was through this method that he hoped "to discover attitudes and opinions that are relatively private and heterogeneous in a structure that is relatively differentiated."[1]

The contacts between the interviewer and his respondents were very short-term. Close relationships (a few weeks) were not maintained with any individuals except the central staffs of the major field studies. The researcher does not believe the peripheral involvement or the more sustained contact had an effect on him as an interviewer. He was able to empathize with all respondents but being mainly interested in their perspectives, was not overly concerned with non-intentional error. It was difficult not to form judgments of people after the interviews; but the interviewer was able to perceive and understand the respondents statements during the interview, and it was this information, rather than spot judgments, which was utilized as data.

It was indicated earlier that peripheral involvement by faculty and staff resulted in each having small amounts of information to impart about the consortium, but it seemed to lead to more accurate appraisals of the action.

In addition, information was easily obtained in the interview

---

1. Morris Zelditch, Jr., "Some Methodological Problems of Field Studies," American Journal of Sociology, 67:571, March 1962.

situation because the respondents did not feel loyalty to either the consortium or to the member colleges. There were few vested interests, and one did not feel that he was criticizing his own organization if he evaluated or shared attitudes about the cooperative.

The peripheral involvement and large number of people interviewed suggest the inefficiencies of field work in an inter-organizational situation. Even if one is admitted to the committee meetings, there are only a few person-to-person interactions during any year, necessitating field work which consists primarily of interviews and historical documents research. A great deal of energy and time is expended for a minimum of information.

It might also be mentioned that campus climates and the nature of the colleges affect the relationship that interviewees have with the researcher. Some of the campuses are large, research-oriented universities whose staffs and faculties understood the nature of the investigation, that the researcher was not a "spy" for someone in the structure, and that the information was to be treated as confidential.

Some faculty at the small liberal arts colleges with strong administrations were uncertain about the interviewer's "true" intentions. There was fear that their words would filter to their presidents. Needless to say, a great deal more time had to be spent with these people in building rapport and in approaching sensitive questions.

THE INTERVIEWER'S EFFECT ON THE SYSTEM

The researcher was very concerned about the influence his investigation and report would have on the systems: they could not help but affect the consortia in some ways. Although the researcher's contact was of low intensity in areas with basically peripheral involvement by most participants, the interviewer did make his respondents think about systems that many had never seriously previously considered.

The researcher's involvement not only focused thoughts about consortia which many indicated would receive their greater attention in the future, but he also served as a carrier of information. Respondents would ask about other projects sponsored by the consortium, which increased general awareness of the voluntary arrangement, but which was not in keeping with the superficial information that some administrators, such as in Lewis State College, imparted to their faculty.

Reciprocities were required in the interaction with the interviewees. The respondents, on the whole, accepted the rationale of the study: attempting to learn about the dynamics of consortia in order to gain theoretical and administrative insights. They were asked to talk about their involvement and could assume the position of teacher or authority in an area that the researcher indicated was poorly understood. The interviews allowed some faculty and staff the opportunity to release aggressions and frustrations.

The researcher was asked to "pay back" some individuals for their information. A number of respondents wanted to learn about the attitudes of their colleagues in their own or in different colleges with respect to the consortium. If possible, the researcher reminded the questioner about his promise of confidentiality, but suggested the respondent read the thesis which would contain his case. There were times when such a curt answer would have been inappropriate--after receiving a very good interview with the option of re-interviewing the respondent in the future. The researcher attempted to be non-committal but gave the requestor a range of attitudes that he had experienced. No reference was made to comments of specific individuals. In at least one case, the investigator received sensitive data after refusing to accede to demands for information supplied by others. The researcher was unaware at the time that he was being "tested."

As another example of returning favors for information divulged during the interviews, the investigator was asked by a middle administrator to help solve a problem he was having with his president. The interviewer attempted to discuss the problem theoretically and not involve himself directly with the troubling situation.

In summary, investigators interested in doing research in an interorganizational context should be aware of the need for and the difficulty of gaining admittance to a number of separate organizations composing voluntary relationships. One needs multiple acceptances but only one rejection to be refused entree. Thus, requests for admittance should precede the intended initiation of the research by a few months, and the time should vary positively with the number of organizations involved and the sensitivity of the relationships.

Once admitted to a consortium, there is not a great deal to observe;

there is a high expenditure of energy for the data collected, but organizational loyalties are of lesser import than in a single organizational study thus enabling the investigator to gain access to sensitive data.

CHAPTER VIII

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

The author has deliberately used a general rather than a specific definition of inter-organizational relationships in higher education because of the variety of patterns represented. Support for this type of definition is given by Ertell[1] who notes that voluntary consortia:

> embrace the variety of arrangements, contracts, understandings, agreements and other relationships which exist between two or more institutions of higher education and which are entered into voluntarily and in such a way that the participants retain their identities and individualities.

Interaction patterns of consortia in this research indicate there was:

1. Coalescing--a joint venture in which two or more organizations act as one for a certain goal.[2] Coser[3] calls this an unstable form; however, it allows groups to come together that would not normally join forces. It is a defensive alignment, usually with one interest in common among the parties. This form was represented by the University Extension Center, the Urban Institute, and the St. Thomas-Sacred College Project.

---

[1] Merton V. Ertell, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education: A Study of Experiences with Reference to New York State, University of the State of New York, Albany, New York, 1957, p. 3.

[2] James D. Thompson, Organizations in Action, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1957, p. 36.

[3] Lewis Coser, The Functions of Social Conflict, The Free Press, New York, 1956, p. 143.

2. Contracting--negotiating an agreement for an exchange of performances in the future.[4] The Federal proposal negotiated each year for the Masters-Lewis Project and the contracts of the Institute for Urban Education fall into this category.

3. Cooptation--absorbing new elements into the policy-making structure of an organization to avert threats to its stability.[5] This form was not a rationale for organizational involvement in a consortium, but cooptation did occur. An aggressive state university was invited into the University Center, and although the school recently established its own campus as a competitor with the Center, the college's involvement in the inter-organizational setting did reduce the possibility of earlier unilateral action.

In addition, the relationship were characterized by:

1. Cooperation--shared internal motivation to solve common and distinctive problems while respecting legitimate group boundaries. This gives rise to a "mass" which the organizational representatives could discuss and operationalize,[6] and operated among some committees of the Association.

---

[4] James D. Thompson, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

[5] *Loc. cit.*

[6] Robert Blake and Jane Mouton, "The Intergroup Dynamics of Win-Lose Conflict and Problem-Solving Collaboration in Union-Management Relations," in Sherif, ed., *Intergroup Relations and Leadership: Approaches and Research in Individual, Ethnic, Cultural, and Political Areas*, John Wiley, New York, 1963, pp. 108-109.

2. Inauthentic cooperation--joint striving on the basis of bribery or coercion.[7] For example, Lewis State College is involved in the project for hard resources, but must "cooperate" in order to attain them. In some cases, willingness to engage in a project is dependent upon the penalties for non-engagement.

3. Antagonistic cooperation--there is a great motivation or need for joining together and to repress the antagonism growing out of the relationship.[8] Many of the prestigious colleges in the Association have this relationship with the less prestigious members.

Briefly, the variety of relationships can be subsumed under "organizational exchange" which Levine and White define as a "voluntary activity between two organizations which has consequences, actual or anticipated, for the realization of their separate goals or objectives."[9]

Hypotheses based on the exchange model and the functions of reward distribution and problem-solving will be discussed in appropriate sections of this chapter.

The guiding aims of this exploratory study have been the development of both theoretical hypotheses and administrative guidelines.

---

[7] See Morton Deutsch, "Conflicts, Productive and Destructive," Journal of Social Issues, 25:7-41.

[8] Lewis Coser, op. cit., p. 140.

[9] Sol Levine and Paul White, "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Interorganizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly, 5:588.

Discussed in this chapter are the hypotheses that are suggested by the data. Because these hypotheses have yet to be tested, it would be improper for the investigator to suggest that their relevance transcends the specific organizations whose structural and functional characteristics gave rise to the ideas.

At the same time, the author realizes that new consortia are being founded on an unprecedented scale, and it would be the unusual administrator who did not grasp at the available "guidelines," regardless of their validity or admonitions by the researcher.

Nevertheless, the ideas presented in this chapter are fruits from the study of five specific voluntary inter-organizational arrangements. Their transfer potential have yet to be demonstrated. If the administrator utilizes the guidelines implicit in the discussion, he should at least hold them as possible but not as the answers to his problems. The presentation of the cases in this study will allow scholars and administrators to posit rationales different from the investigator's for the dynamics described.

Although the author is interested in working toward a theory of inter-organizational relationships, it should be recognized that the organizational structures outlined in these chapters are voluntary in nature. In addition, the problems these organizations face are usually amenable to solutions by means other than inter-organizational interaction.

The hypotheses are discussed under their relevant headings. First steps toward their operationalization are presented in Appendix C.

THE ENVIRONMENT

Since consortia consists of members who are located at various distances from each other and because they are mechanisms created to rectify the problems presently affecting the institutions and the society in which they are located, it is evident that environmental factors will have a pervasive effect on consortia dynamics. The cases have isolated the importance of the physical, political, social, and professional environments.

The Physical Environment

The author studied consortia whose members are located from two to two thousand miles from each other. Obviously, the physical proximity of member colleges is associated with a greater potential for interaction. Although the actual interaction rates may depend on non-environmental factors, the investigator was told, only by representatives who had to travel long distances for meetings, that interaction was too costly, usually in time, but for one college in money. It should be noted that at times the peripherally involved use "excessive travel time" as an excuse for non-attendance at joint meetings.

In addition, the physical proximity of member institutions to a central headquarters is related to the ease and the desire of the colleges to administer a joint program. The University Extension Center clearly indicates that colleges "local" to the center will identify with the region and will more likely work on projects that are designed to affect that region's higher educational situation. The investigator found Association representatives who were located near the Center to have easier access to the central staff and to use them for administrative support. When in one case this support was lacking, because of the difficulty of transacting business due to distance, the representative became somewhat negative about future administrative involvement.

It should be noted that proximity to a central headquarters is not only related to involvement, but it has implications for the relationship among members if they are conceived to be "equal." Some colleges will become more involved and gain more leadership positions. Central headquarters should be centrally located.

It is functional for the central facility to be located in an urban area. The Association established a library center in an urban center which helped attract staff and which facilitates the delivery of books to members because of good transportation facilities. It should also be noted, as the University Extension Center suggests, that there is more money and personnel in urban areas for environmental support.

A listing of "college center" type consortia makes clear the geographic nature of the relationships: a great number have regional designation in their names, e.g., the Kansas City Regional Council, the Associated Colleges of the Midwest. The cases quite strongly indicate that the location of member colleges in different geographical regions is dysfunctional for cooperation between organizations in the different regions. The Association's members identified with different geographical sectors of their state, having established study centers in cities and having joined a library consortium with institutions they felt were in their region. The Masters-Lewis Project stresses the point that interaction among participants is facilitated by similar norms and understandings resulting from common environmental constraints. The Northerners and Southerners had difficulty transcending their environmental contexts.

Physical distance also has an effect on the type of programming with which a consortium becomes involved. The greater the distance among members the more likely the institutions will develop separate projects under the consortium umbrella rather than join forces on specific programs. The Association sponsors some joint programs, such as faculty seminars, but fails to share equipment and professors because of distance, and sponsors programs whereby each college has its own speakers series and research grants. In the bilateral between Masters University and Lewis State College, the Northern institution educates the Southern undergraduates, and the state college sends its faculty and staff to graduate centers for further education.

The Political Environment

There are political implications or involvements with most of the consortia studied. For some, such as the two major cases, it is in the nature of federally supported programs; for others, such as the Extension Center, it takes the form of a desire to be visible to the state legislature. Those programs or goals having political implications are visable, and those politically funded are short-term. The Urban Institute, the Association, and the Masters-Lewis Project need something to sell to the government and must maintain support from this sector.

However, political support, when consortia are beholden to public officials, must transcend the monetary. As the bureaucratic, red-tape frustrations experienced by the Association's out-of-state member and the Masters-Lewis property exchanges indicate, public officials must be willing to "relax" policies when state colleges are interacting in a private consortium. And, of course, public officials must be willing to finance their institutions involvement in private groups in the first place.

The Social Environment

Colleges join consortia either to remove present dysfunctions or problems or to gain benefits having their origin in new challenges or programs; that is, there can be either a positive or negative motivation for participation.

First, with regard to the negative motivation, the study clearly indicates that the more threatening the environment, the greater the impetus for the threatened organization to join in a consortium. The Association's Colleges are very concerned but not yet greatly affected by their state college system, and the multilateral devised by St. Thomas University was in response to the insecure position of the private colleges in their region of the state. In a sense, this hypothesis is related to Mason Haire's[10] finding that the organization tends to grow fastest where forces tending to destroy it are greatest. In addition, it is the author's belief, as evidenced by the Association's counselor program, that the greater the (potential) environmental crisis, the greater the thrust for a combined internal/external orientation by members. There is the awareness that one's position is dependent upon the viability of those in similar circumstances.

---

[10] Mason Haire, "Biological Models and Empirical Histories of the Growth of Organizations," in Haire, ed., Modern Organizational Theory, John Wiley, New York, 1959, p. 292.

In addition, the cases indicate that the greater the environmental opportunities for alternative joint arrangements or alternative need satisfaction, the less the internally motivated will be concerned about the need satisfactions of other member organizations. The Association's prestigious members; Lewis State College, a Negro institution in 1969; and the Extension Center university that established its own campus all have or had alternative options and are less concerned about the welfare of their institutional colleagues.

Whether internally or externally oriented, many colleges studied had positive motivations for involvement: to contribute to a social cause or to offer its sisters a quality, low-cost graduate education. However, the cases indicate that the greater the thrust for consortia by environmental forces holding positive or negative sanctions, for reasons unacknowledged by the potential membership, the more peripheral the involvement in and output of consortia. For instance, a donor corporation and wealthy institutional trustees motivated colleges to participate in the Association. As a result, there is limited program output, and ever limited involvement in policy making. In short, there is a positive association between initiation and commitment.

Commitment to a new order, as springing from an adherance to a liberal social policy, in the Masters case, or commitment to the status quo, as evidenced by Southern officials, point to the pervasive effect the political and social attitudes of bureaucrats and educators have on the motivation for and problems encountered in consortia. But even given social support, the cases indicate that inter-collegiate arrangements will suffer if legal regulations and social norms, such as mailing regulations, are inhospitable to inter-organizational structures.

The Professional Environment

The last environmental influence discovered to be related to consortia functioning are the professional associations to which organizational representatives belong. As the example of the Association's development officers clearly indicates, the stronger the professional associations of organizational representatives, the less the individuals' need for interaction within the context of a voluntary consortium.

In addition, the activity of the Association's library group suggests that the more dynamic the changes occurring in a professional field, the more likely the representatives will interact, in a consortium if one is available.

GOALS

It is necessary to distinguish among the official goals, the operational goals, and the actual goals. The first are the purposes that appear in charters, the second are goals on a lower level of generality, such as the projects agreed upon by the participants, and the latter consist of the motivations of the incumbents. They may conflict with each other. In this section the author is concerned primarily with operational goals and will examine the scope of goals, commitment toward them, and goal overlap.

Scope of Goals

The consortia studied differ with respect to the diffuseness-specificity of their operational goals. The Association and the Masters-

Lewis Project are open-ended, but the Extension Center and the St. Thomas-Sacred College Project are goal specific. The former are geared toward expansion and the latter toward maintenance. It might seem, with some support by the behavior of college representatives in the Extension Center, that the more specific the initial goals, the more difficult consortium expansion. The consortium initially attracts those with specific vested interests. The more specific the goals, however, the easier their operationalization, inasmuch as "the means" will be built in.

The current Association President made a conscious decision when he took office to expand the operational goals in order to attract a large variety of representatives from the member institutions. Operating within a diffuse goal situation, he, as a forward-looking, thrustful President, attempted to shape and to guide the growth of the consortium. The open-ended situation suited his personality characteristics, as the closed nature of the Extension Center suited its administrator.

Frustrations and objective difficulties will occur when the director's personality characteristics and the scope of the consortium are non-related and when one desires to involve heterogeneous elements from the membership in a goal specific situation.

While in the field, the author found evidence suggesting support of Raven and Rietsema's[11] hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between the clarity of the group situation, and group belonginess and attractiveness. And diffuse goal situations allow for greater difficulty in establishing the organizational identity of the consortium. Numerous representatives in the organizations involved in the major case studies indicate their uncertainty of the consortium's purposes and boundaries which they admit has a negative effect on their participation.

---

[11] Bertram H. Raven and Jan Rietsema, "The Effects of Varied Clarity of Group Goal and Group Path Upon the Individual and His Relation to His Group," Human Relations, 10:35, 37.

In addition, the cases demonstrate that unless a consortium has unlimited resources, the diffuse oriented consortium will have a limited effect on the elements in the member institutions while the goal specific consortium, such as the Extension Center, will have a pervasive effect on the function for which it is designed.

If diffuseness has a detrimental effect on participation and effect, it also allows operational goals to be decided by environmental forces. The Association is defined to a large degree by the grants outside agencies make, rather than by the conscious pre-planning of the membership.

Commitment

The Association's behavior has led to the formulation of hypotheses concerning commitment to goals. The first, concerning goal displacement is also supported by the dynamics of the Urban Institute in the eyes of some of the staff members. Namely, the more peripherally and internally oriented the organizational representatives and centrally and externally oriented the staff, the more likely goal displacement: the means will determine the ends. Given similar conditions, the more likely the representatives will engage in incremental and the staff in synoptic decision-making. The Association's activities also point to the relationship between peripheral involvement and goal visability and immediate feedback. Lacking are resources or vision for a long-term effort.

However, the colleges at times find a vicious circle operating: an inability to initially fund a consortium in order to gain environmental inputs because the members lack initial monies.

It seems to be a truism that consortia will grow in accordance with the time and money the members give tothe joint enterprise; and as the Ford Foundation's reaction to the Association's library project indicates, funding agencies will more likely contribute to a joint project if that project first has the commitment of all of a consortium's members. However, most consortia, including those studied, allow the members freedom in adopting new goals. This is functional for member participation and long-range growth; it allows trust and knowledge about other members a chance to develop. However, freedom to participate is detrimental to short-range expansion. Thus, such an option should depend on the urgency of the situation. And as the Association's aborted art program demonstrates, if the situation is not urgent, initial projects should be chosen that have a high chance of success in order to initiate a developmental dynamic.

The investigator finds that commitment of individuals is based on their involvement in consortia, that for many, it has to be initial involvement or they feel slighted. Initial involvement is difficult to arrange in an open-ended consortium. In addition, as the Association's lake program indicates, operational goals should be based on the facilities, personnel, and goals of the member institutions. Programs bringing in people from the outside may be conceived of as threats, as the Masters-Lewis Project and the faculty programs of the Association so clearly demonstrate. However, voluntary projects should not duplicate already existing programs or place them in a voluntary context. It is the investigator's belief that because of vested interests the incumbents would react negatively to the attempt, unless they were given leadership positions vis-a-vis the projects, which given "equality" among members could, of course, result in the generation of hostilities.

Goal Overlap

Social psychologists discuss the need to identify superordinate goals if groups are to cooperate. For instance, Sherif[12] says a superordinate goal is possible when two or more groups can find a common purpose to which each can strive without sacrificing the members' cherished aspirations. There must be, of course, a means of communicating these goals to each other.

The author finds that the colleges involved in consortia do cooperate on the basis of shared needs, such as the Association's lecture program or research grants project indicate. However, the investigator also finds cooperation based on the complementary goals of members: each college achieves different payoffs through participation in a common program. The St. Thomas-Sacred College Project and the initial phase of the Urban Institute are based upon such a goal relationship; and, it is the author's belief that complementary goals are easier to identify than superordinate ones; and since they are more "private," might lead to a greater organizational commitment. In addition, complementary goals necessitate less interaction for their identification than superordinate

---

12. Musafer Sherif, Group Conflict and Cooperation: Their Social Psychology, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London, 1966, pp. 88, 107.

ones, and make compromising less necessary, which by definition makes goals more attractive.

Unfortunately, the colleges studied seem to be more interested in increasing inputs than in assessing the quality of outputs resulting from consortium involvement. Thompson[13] suggests, if intrinsic measures of goal attainment are unavailable or difficult to establish, extrinsic measures are used. Because of such difficulty, the number of research grants is of greater import than assessing whether the grants have produced meaningful research.

CENTRAL STAFF/GOVERNANCE

Not all of the consortia studied have separate full-time central staffs, some are governed by administrators who hold the leadership position as a part-time responsibility. Regardless of the amount of time such work takes, however, one of the strongest findings of the study is that the thrust of the director or coordinator is related to the viability and growth of the consortium. Regardless of the members' orientation, consortia will most likely have secondary importance to organizational representatives. A director who is a synoptic thinker, an idealist with drive, as demonstrated in the Association, the Masters-Lewis Project, and the Urban Center, will be associated with organizational growth. Absence of such qualities, as represented in the University Extension Center, leads to stultification.

The director must be able to identify and to create needs for the members and to locate resources to fill them. As the Association amply demonstrates, the less successful the director in obtaining resources from the environment, the more likely his administrative rather than leadership role will be accepted by the membership, and the weaker the central agency. The Association and the Urban Center also demonstrate that the more forward-looking the director in an open-ended or diffuse purpose consortium, the greater the possibility of losing consortium and gaining separate entity status.

---

[13] James D. Thompson, op. cit., p. 91.

Central staff members must fill a variety of roles to satisfy the expectations and fill the needs of the large number of people from the member colleges with whom they interact. These roles include: coordinator, channel of information, initiator, catalyst, diplomat, and public relations man. As the role behavior of the Association President indicates, these expectations will create role conflict and its accompanying frustrations. Reactions to the Association staff's work leads the author to believe that the greater the generalist orientation of the staff, the less likely will it be able to satisfy the expectations of the specialists at the member colleges. Said one representative, "I'm glad for the information about educational research sent by the staff, but they don't know what educational research is."

There is, therefore, a tendency for organizational representatives to express a desire for more specialist competencies by the staff. It might be functional for staff administrators to be more competent scholars in order to be able to work constructively with member faculty; but the data suggests that administrative representatives, regardless of what they say, would be hostile to more competent staff administrators.

As business managers and some librarians who reacted to the Association's administrators in these areas suggest, they will be perceived as challenges to members' competencies. Regardless of academic competence, administrators do not present a professional challenge to faculty.

The dynamics of central staff governance is heavily dependent upon the orientation of the member colleges toward the consortium. Because of the variety of patterns requested, it is impractical to suggest all of the possible variations, or exceptions to the variations, on the following theme. On the basis of the author's observations, it is suggested that the more peripherally and internally oriented the member colleges: (1) the greater the frustrations and tensions experienced by a director with a central/external orientation; (2) the more likely the members will envision the director as an administrative aide, rather than a leader, and the greater their attention on administrative rather than policy issues; (3) given staff thrust, the greater the central agency's concern for appearances of legitimacy and the more monocratic the organization becomes; and (4) the fewer risks the staff will take for fear of destroying the limited commitment that exists.

THE MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

General Observations

The data suggest a number of hypotheses that relate to the dynamics of consortia member organizations or their parts.

It was mentioned earlier that shared crisis tends to create the conditions for collaboration. However, as this condition increases organizational interdependence, so crisis within one organization will limit that organization's interaction in a consortium. One of the Association's members, as discussed in the case study, was undergoing stress created by the firing of its president; and that member's behavior confirmed Hermann's[14] suggestion that crisis tends to increase the tendency of individuals and units to withdraw.

The cases studied also strongly suggest that it is functional for organizations to interact in their strong rather than in their weak areas. A standard remark by interviewees was, "why exchange with Organization "X"; what can they do for me?" And members of Organization X did not desire to interact in their weak areas in order to maintain self-respect. It should be noted, as the Master -Lewis Project strongly suggests, that interaction in weak areas prevents reciprocation which this study finds to be of importance in exchange relations. In short, the less viable the institution or part in a consortium, the less will it participate in joint programs: it has fewer resources, as some Association college demonstrate, and/or the personnel feel inadequate, as Lewis State College clearly shows.

This hypothesis complements Guetzkow's[15] finding that amalgamation did not occur because of the weaknesses of governments, but after substantial increases in the capabilities of some units. In addition, Deutsch[16] finds:

---

[14] C. F. Hermann, "Some Consequences of Crisis Which Limit the Viability of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly, 8:66.

[15] Harold Guetzkow, "Relations Among Organizations," in R. Bowers, ed., Studies on Behavior in Organizations: A Research Symposium, University of Georgia Press, Athens, 1966, p. 28.

[16] Morton Deutsch, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-36.

> the ability to offer and to engage in authentic cooperation presupposes an awareness that one is neither helpless nor powerless, even though one is at a relative disadvantage. Not only independent action but also cooperative action requires a recognition and confirmation of one's capacity to 'go it alone' if necessary....Powerlessness and the associated lack of self and group esteem are not conducive to internal group cohesiveness or to external cooperation.

It is obvious that organizations with similar strengths and weaknesses will not find it functional to exchange resources in those areas. Association members do not exchange professors because they have about the same expertise, but Masters and Lewis can exchange greenhouse materials because they are strong in different plant collections.

The data also show that the growth areas in the member institutions, the developing sectors, are likely to take advantage of consortium involvement for needed inputs. One developing association member took advantage of an experimental chemistry program; growth areas are looked at carefully by representatives responsible for grant distribution; and, of course, Lewis State College is a developing institution. However, as suggested by the "privitism" of the Masters chemistry department, those areas undergoing development have neither the time nor the finances for external considerations. Thus, developing institutions, or their parts, are more likely to have an internal rather than external orientation.

The developmental level of the institutions or parts also has import when joint programs are devised for equal benefit by the members. The greater the developmental heterogeneity of the institutional areas for which projects are designed, the less likely the project will satisfy any particular institution's requirements. The Association's visiting lecture program and library processing center are either not subscribed to, or are with dissension, because members have different needs for lectures, based on the strengths of their own programs, and are purchasing different quantities of books, based on the developmental state of their curricula.

As the hypothesis that "developing areas are likely to take advantage of consortia inputs" suggests, inter-organizational mechanisms do at times contribute to organizational innovation. Developing Lewis College used the project for devising new curricula in English and the social sciences, going outside the institution's structure because the regular channels, if used, would have led to conflict and possible failure.

If innovation includes augmenting some campus program, the project can "enhance an institution's competitive position and strengthen confidence in terms of student and faculty retension and the respect of other schools."[17] The author suggests that the provision of research monies, the opportunity for professional growth through seminars, and lecture programs may have such an effect on the Association's colleges. By changing levels of expectations, consortia change the nature of the member campuses.

Campuses have different climates. The author finds that the different values, goals, constraints, and associated tensions are not conducive to interaction among those from differing environments. The data indicate that the similarities and dissimilarities can be character-

---

17. Raymond S. Moore, "Interinstitutional Cooperation," in Current Issues in Higher Education, 1967, American Association for Higher Education, Washington, 1967, p. 273.

ized in a variety of ways: an open/closed climate, a gemeinshaft/geselleshaft society, an authoritarian/collegial environment, or an intellectual/instrumental/collegiate culture. Similarity of organizational climate is functional for interaction. As examples, Masters faculty held the Lewis climate, a collegiate, fun-loving, football atmosphere, in professional contempt; the Association's community college member sponsored a number of conferences for other community colleges, outside the consortium, for a variety of reasons, but felt more "at home" with these colleagues than with Association members.

Before closing this section there are a number of ideas which merit discussion. First, resistance over a common admissions form for Association members is a prime example of the hypothesis that organizations are unlikely to engage in projects which detract from individual identity, image, distinctiveness, or autonomy. Colleges will be likely to sustain the "loss," however, for significant additions of prestige, as the Association's admissions situation also suggests; and theoretically, if the potential penalties are too great--such as non-survival.

Second, the stronger an institution's local commitments, the less likely these commitments will be transferred to the inter-organizational setting. In the data, these commitments have taken the form of trustee and community associations by the colleges which place potential programs out of inter-organizational consideration. Colleges have also built relationships with local high schools. Although consortia officials have faith that the drawing of new organizational boundaries can lead to strength, the author believes if current interaction patterns between representatives and their constituents are disturbed, it can also lead to disaster.

Third, the failure of Association business managers to join a common computer, some representatives say for fear that confidential information will be seen by other members, and this consortium's lack of success with a Washington representative, suggest the more confidential or strategic the information in some organizational functions, the less likely the joint programs will involve such functions.

Fourth, the more strategic the equipment owned by a consortium, such as a research vessel, the greater the organizational members' commitment to the consortium; and fifth, in an open-ended consortium, organizational size is related to the number and success of consortium programs. The larger Association members had more research proposals to fund. In short, there is a greater potential identification of problem-solving and reward functions by the members.

Organizational Prestige/Strength

The study has isolated the prestige variable as having a great deal of significance for interaction patterns in consortia. In addition to prestige, the educational organizations can be strong or weak.[18] The prestige variable is based on the perceptions of the interviewees in which environmental context is important. The strength variable is an objective measure. An important mediating variable in the interaction is whether the consortium is conceived to be among equals or unequals.

The data suggest that a significant goal of college organizations is to increase their prestige.[19] Lewis State College and the Association's colleges have their eyes on the prestige leaders. As Thompson suggests, "organizations subject to rationality norms and competing for support seek prestige."[20] However, this is more an affective than a rational quest. For image reasons the Extension Center took over a campus with a resulting decrease in profits. It seems, to increase prestige is an intrinsic value which may be negatively related to actual costs and benefits.

---

[18] The interview data support the importance of "prestige," but the author believes a combination of "prestige" and "strength" in a four-fold table has heuristic value.

The case data suggest the following hypotheses with regard to interaction among institutions having different degrees of strength and prestige.

If the relationship is defined to be among equals, (the Association, the Urban Institute, the Extension Center), the more prestigious/stronger will not desire to interact with the less prestigious/weaker, but with those having a similar or higher standing. The interesting exceptions are the administrators, rather than faculty, in the Extension Center who were "putting on a show" for the legislature. In addition, the Association suggests that the prestigious/stronger institutions will gain a larger percentage of the hard resources, and the weaker/less prestigious will gain less; but nevertheless, it will be interpreted as a great deal because of their relative deprivation. They will also gain the important symbolic reward of being in "the company of giants."

If the relationship is defined to be among unequals (the Masters-

---

[19] See Edward Gross, "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach," American Sociological Review, 33:530.

[20] James D. Thompson, op. cit., p. 33.

6

Lewis Project, the St. Thomas-Sacred College program), the more prestigious/stronger will not object to interacting with the less prestigious/weaker. In addition, the greater the prestige/strength gap between the institutions, the more peripheral and external the orientation of the stronger, more prestigious organization. The gap in the relationship between the two Catholic colleges is small: St. Thomas is only somewhat externally and peripherally oriented, enough to humor the women's college.

Inequality can also lead to unilateral interaction with the resulting perception of paternalism. The case data indicate, however, that interaction can be unilateral, but problems avoided if the prestigious/stronger organization gives the interaction pattern the appearance of equality, as for instance, St. Thomas accepting the cost of interaction.

However, regardless of the defined equality of members in a consortium, the weaker, less prestigious organizations attempt interaction in those areas where their strengths, not weaknesses, will be apparent. The Extension Center's small local colleges give courses that are the strongest in their curricula, and the relationship between St. Thomas and Sacred College is based on curricula strength.

Organizational Conflict

The investigator did not observe a great deal of hostility among the organizational members of consortia; the question, therefore, is why? The early history of the Urban Institute was conflictful because each college, which had a different disciplinary thrust toward education, had an internal orientation. But the rewards were too small for a central motivation. The two Catholic colleges received a great number of rewards but were not competing for the same goals, and the Association's admissions officers did not conflict because the joint gain was so large that no one wanted to gamble on its loss, and there was enough for all to be easily satisfied. Thus, one can hypothesize that organizational members with central/internal orientations will conflict with each other unless their goals are complementary or the joint gain large enough to satisfy the members and prevent hard bargaining.

As a college tends toward an external orientation, as demonstrated by Masters University, the less likely the organization will conflict with others. Long-range goals and commitment to the viability of the system reduce conflict potential.

Similarly, as a college tends toward peripheral involvement, there is a reduction in the amount of conflict. As the Association suggests, the relationship is worth neither much positive nor negative energy. But there are a great number of minor annoyances, although few are large enough to produce outbursts.

The investigator finds a relationship between peripheral involvement and the amount of intra-institutional information about consortium activities, And the less the flow of information, the greater the potential for intra-institutional conflict. For instance, business managers unaware of the commitments of their organizations' representatives were likely to become angered when told about those made that cost money. It is noteworthy that the Associatinn's central staff was used as a scapegoat in the former example: it is a great deal more dangerous to express one's hostility and resentment to a fellow worker than to the agency staff.

The data also suggest a number of methods of conflict reduction: introduce a third party, reduce interaction, and have organizational exclusive control over a function.

The Association successfully used outside parties, in the form of community trustees, as a means of controlling conflict; the trustees had some sanctions over the institutional presidents. The Urban and Extension Center used consultants. However, it is the author's belief that even a "paradigm" would have the same effect. It is an outside mediating force affecting interaction.

The Association also reduced conflict by lessening the degree of inter-organizational interaction. There is less time to discuss policy issues and the amount of hostility over technical means is usually not great.

And last, the University Extension Center clearly demonstrates that there is little conflict when organizations contribute in specified areas and they need not discuss or defend the nature or quality of their input with other members. Member organizations should have exclusive control over some functions.

THE ORGANIZATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES

Organizational Position

The data suggest that among administrative personnel, staff rather than line will more likely possess work-related attitudes and tools functional for inter-organizational collaboration. Porter[21] posits that staff are more likely to be cooperative, adaptable, agreeable, tactful, and more other-directed than line personnel who are likely to be forceful, imaginative, and independent. Zajonc and Wolfe[22] find that staff employees have wider communication contacts than line employees.

Line personnel are active in the cases under study; in fact, line initiated the Urban and Extension Centers. However, the author judged line personnel to have somewhat more difficulty operating in an inter-organizational context because of the vested interests they represent. Line, it seems, are more internally and staff more externally oriented.

The study suggests, as is apparent with the current president of the Association's Board, that the greater the commitment of a line representative to a consortium, the greater his inter-role conflict. In addition, staff who have a "built-in" service orientation, such as research coordinator, are likely to have the inter-organizational effort supply the needed inputs.

Data from all the case studies strongly suggest that representatives high in their organizations' hierarchy will more likely possess the power and/or authority to involve their organizations' lower participants, possess the strategic and functional knowledge for policy making and program planning, and have a greater security in committing their institution to joint programs and agreements.

---

[21] Lyman W. Porter, Organizational Patterns of Managerial Job Attitudes, American Foundation for Management Research, 1964, pp. 42, 56.

[22] Robert B. Zajonc and Donald M. Wolfe, "Cognitive Consequences of a Person's Position in a Formal Organization," Human Relations, 19:148.

A reoccurring theme in the study is that representatives who are on the boundary of their organizations are more likely than non-boundary personnel to plan programs or have "meaningful interaction in a consortium context. Many active Association representatives are boundary personnel who have close and continuous contact with environmental elements and have some degree of freedom from peer contact. As the behavior of Lewis representatives indicate, however, boundary personnel can also include individuals who are not immersed in a system; and as exampled by the initiator of the St. Thomas-Sacred College Project, those whose previous external experiences motivate them into consortia involvement. Katz[23] believes that "accomplishments of functional contributions to a system requires a degree of autonomy from that system." However, too great an isolation, being "ignored" by one's institution or alienated from colleagues, as occurred with a number of Lewis and Association personnel, is not conducive to inter-organizational involvement. It is interesting to note that many cooperative programs utilize the boundary permeating functions of organizational representatives, e.g., lectures and concerts rather than research.

With regard to representatives' functions, the data from the Association suggest that there will be a positive transfer of attitudes, knowledge, and behavioral patterns from those in organizational positions to those in consortium roles. It is functional to choose delegates to work on consortium programs who are responsible for similar programs within their institutions, e.g., lectures, research grants. However, "positive transfer" may be dysfunctional since some organizational positions are characterized by behavior not attuned to the consortium's needs, e.g., deans who question but do not initiate, "bureaucrats" who do not make policy.

---

[23] Fred E. Katz, "The School as a Complex Social Organization: A Consideration of Patterns of Autonomy," Harvard Educational Review, 34:438.

The last hypothesis to be noted in this section is derived from an Association problem which was created by giving a representative formal, legal responsibility for a program, as was required by the contract agency, when the colleagues believed the individual was operating as the informal leader. When "equality" is assumed by organizational representatives, formal leadership should be vested in an individual detached from involvement in the program; it has no place within the voluntary working group.

Role

As the previous hypothesis suggests, role expectations and relations with peers are of some importance for organizational representatives.

The Masters-Lewis Project indicates that major organizational representatives (coordinators) must have the support, respect, and trust of their constituents in order for the colleagues to be attracted to consortium activities. The highly popular Masters coordinator attracted and the unpopular Lewis director repulsed potential representatives. As the case indicates, it is also functional for respect to exist on the part of the other organizations' members.

There is, however, a difference between peer trust and peer expectations. Association activity suggests that the more specific the expectations of the reference groups or significant others to the representative, the more likely he will engage in or perceive conflict. Representatives charged with obtaining specific speakers for their lecture program sustain greater role conflict than those who have the freedom to make their decision without such constraints.

It should also be noted that an external commitment on the part of an organization's representatives helps solidify that organization's community. The Masters representatives who went South to assess Lewis State College were all focused on the same problem unrelated to selfish concerns at home. Some Masters representatives report increased social contacts with project members as a result of involvement.

Similarly, Association data suggest that projects are avoided if they have the effect of destroying representatives' present interaction patterns. Ties with local constituents or high school guidance counselors are too valuable for consortia to usurp.

Pride/Strength

Organizational representatives judge the prestige and strengths of their colleagues as they do these qualities in member organizations.

Given "defined equality" among the members, data from the Association suggest that the more and the less prestigious/strong faculty avoid interaction where their abilities will be juxtaposed. The former do not want to associate with the weaker, and the latter have no desire to demonstrate their limited abilities. Given "inequality," the same holds for the weaker faculty, but the stronger do not object to interacting; many enjoy the opportunity to demonstrate their abilities. However, as the Lewis Project demonstrates, the motivation must be perceived to be "constructive" by the counterparts or the weaker institution's representatives will not desire to participate. In addition, Masters representatives' actions suggest, the more disparate the strengths of the institutions in a helping relationship, the less likely will the faculty from the stronger organization engage in the effort. The costs are too great and the success potential too low.

The Masters-Lewis Project suggests some other hypotheses. First, as the Lewis English and physics/chemistry areas demonstrate, for the less prestigious institution, the more similar to his counterpart an organizational representative's perceptions of the strengths of his institution or area, acceptance of the standing, and desire to improve it, the greater the interaction with those in the stronger institution for upgrading purposes. Second, the viability of an inter-organizational relationship depends upon the recognition of counterparts' pride and colleagues' non-reliance on this human quality. In addition, this project, but to a greater extent the Extension Center, indicate that inter-organizational programs will be opposed by representatives who feel they might have a negative effect on their institution's quality.

BENEFITS (REWARDS AND PROBLEM-SOLVING)

The investigator began this study under the assumption that organizations will collaborate if there are benefits to such involvement. The data substantiate this assumption. As the behavior of the Association's colleges who joined together for outside funding suggest, the greater the potential benefits from joint action, the more likely voluntary participation in consortia.

The degree of involvement (peripheral/central) is dependent upon the significance of the benefits: size of rewards, need of problem solution. The Association's librarians and admissions officers gained in these categories and were centrally involved. One member of the Extension Center became more peripherally involved after he established his own campus near the Center and was able to garner his rewards from his own source.

In addition, Association data suggest that organizational representatives achieving benefits from participation are more likely to become involved in other consortium activities. This hypothesis is similar to Grusky's[24] finding: "the greater the rewards an individual has received or expects to receive, the greater his commitment to the system." The benefits can include research funds, or meeting professional or personal needs: new inputs for courses or an opportunity for experimentation outside the regular organizational framework.

The data also indicate that a purely internal orientation, a short-term utilitarian posture, is not conducive to the growth of a consortium. The individual members of the Urban Center with this view looked for self-rewards with little concern for the overall viability of the enterprise which was near collapse because of this attitude. On the other hand, as the Masters faculty who desired monetary payment suggest, a purely external orientation (long term/normative) is not conducive to the forward motion which develops from receiving rewards.

---

[24] Oscar Grusky, "Career Mobility and Organizational Commitment," Administrative Science Quarterly, 10:490.

A combination of the two, internal and external orientations, based on payoffs and a larger commitment, is most conducive to consortium growth and development. Whyte and Williams[25] indicate "...when social consciousness and economics have a joint payoff, those who are able to see the long-range implications of one may be able to see the long-range implications of the other." Many examples of this phenomenon have been presented in the case studies, e.g., St. Thomas was able to reduce the threats of the state university and contribute to the welfare of the Catholic church.

It is functional for each member to have both utilitarian and normative rationales for involvement. But the Masters-Lewis Project clearly indicates that organizations entering a consortium for different benefits, rewards or problem-solving, will find communication and program development difficult.

Costs

Masters University personnel and a researcher from a major university collaborating with the Association indicate the greater the costs of inter-organizational involvement, the more likely the organization or the representatives will take an internal rather than external orientation. As the costs of involvement mount, whether in time or in money, the incumbents are more likely to ask, "What is in it for me?" And consequently, rewards will have to be found for these individuals.

---

[25] William Foote Whyte and Lawrence K. Williams, Toward an Integrated Theory of Development: Economic and Non-Economic Variables in Rural Development, New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1968, p. 48.

It seems therefore, that combined internal and external motivations are not only functional, but the greater the costs of the latter the more likely the former will be sought.

In addition, the St. Thomas-Sacred College interaction indicates that the organizations that sustain the greater cost desire to maintain control over policy; and furthermore, their counterparts expect them to maintain this greater control.

Rewards

One of the oft-noted situations in the cases is that the reward function will be less conflict-laden when organizational representatives have heterogeneous or complementary operational goals, perspectives, expectations, or needs. There does, of course, have to be a massing on a general need, but once this is agreed upon, organizational differences allow a "softer distribution." The Association's admissions officers representing different types of colleges attracting different student bodies, the complementary goals of St. Thomas University and Sacred College, the heterogeneous purposes of the major universities (to impress the legislature) and the local colleges (to serve the region) in the Extension Center are but three instances of this phenomenon.

The reaction of Lewis State College personnel to the infusions by Masters University suggests the greater the rewards received from membership, the greater an organization's desire to reciprocate. However, if there is an inability for such a pay-back, the organization will attempt to limit interaction but to maintain the flow of rewards. The bilateral also indicates that the greater an organization's generalized need for rewards, the less likely reciprocation will be possible.

Individuals, as well as organizations achieve pay-offs from consortia involvement. The behavior of some representatives responsible for the distribution of research grants in the Association suggests that power accrues to individuals determining the disposition of scarce strategic resources. If the pay-off is not in power, the organizations must reward representatives in some other way for their involvement. Masters University let it be known that consortium involvement for its representatives would count toward organizational rewards. It might also be noted that a consortium's organizational representatives, as exampled by Lewis State College personnel and an Association research group, should receive similar prerequisites for their involvement, or hostilities aimed either at the consortium or their institutions will result.

Problem-Solving

As the reward function is related to heterogeneity, so problem-solving among organizations is positively related to the homogeneity of their goals, needs, purposes, or perspectives. Once again, the case studies contain many examples of this phenomenon. For instance, the homogeneity of the Association librarian's operations and needs resulted in a library processing center. Also, the lack of homogeneity among the needs of the Association's visiting lecture committee members and the community and college representatives of the Extension Center leads to conflict, and makes it difficult for Masters to solve Lewis' problems.

The disciplinary interaction of this bilateral suggests that problem-solving activity is more likely among representatives of strong paradigmatic disciplines, such as music, chemistry, English (grammar), that the paradigm is an objective outside force controlling interpersonal interaction.

Because of the different requirements of the problem-solving and reward functions, and the suggested complexity of inter-organizational relationships, the following observation by a former official of the U.S. Office of Education[26] has a great deal of relevance:

> Single purpose consortiums appear to be more easily maintained than do multi-purpose consortiums. The large ones whose activities are directed to a single purpose...have a narrower scope and perhaps for this reason are easier to maintain than are small bilateral arrangements that cut across numerous academic disciplines and administrative lines and involve facilities, faculty, and students.

SUMMARY

A large number of hypotheses have been formulated on the basis of the exploratory field experience. Some seem, to the author, to be more "powerful" than others. Accordingly, nine hypotheses are listed below which, it is suggested, have major significance for the functioning of inter-organizational relationships in higher education.

1. The more threatening the environment, the greater the impetus for the threatened organizations to join in a consortium.
2. The nature of consortium involvement (internal/external, peripheral/central) is dependent upon the nature and significance of the benefits from such interaction.

---

[26] Raymond S. Moore, Consortiums in Higher Education: 1965-66. Report of an Exploratory Study, Office of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1968, p. 20.

3. Colleges interacting in strength areas will increase the probabilities of reciprocation and mutual respect within the consortium context.

4. Interaction patterns are strongly related to the prestige ratings of the member organizations and representatives in a consortium.

5. The thrust of the director (idealist, high task activity) is related to the growth of a consortium.

6. Representatives on the boundaries of their respective organizations are more likely than non-boundary personnel to have "meaningful interaction" in a consortium.

7. The reward function will be less conflict-laden when the organizational representatives have heterogeneous or complementary operational goals, perspectives, expectations, or needs.

8. Problem-solving among organizational representatives is related to the homogeneity of their goals, needs, purposes, or perspectives.

9. Problem-solving activity is more likely among representatives of highly paradigmatic disciplines.

It is the investigator's belief that the testing of the hypotheses in this chapter will contribute to the understanding necessary for the maintenance and flourishing of consortia.

APPENDIX A

THE HEURISTIC FRAMEWORK

External System

Political & Economic Factors	Social Norms & Public Opinion	Physical Environment	Characteristics of Involved Higher Educational Organizations	Explicit Purposes & Present State of the Consortium

(Ind. Var.)
Latent Role Orientation

(Ind. Var.)
Perception of Significance
(Benefits)
Peripheral Central

	Internal	External
	Representative	Educator
	Manager	Statesman

Role Factors

Felt Needs

Organizational Position	Personality	Previous Experience on Committees, or Consortia	Membership in Other groups

Observed Needs

Peer Groups	Significant Others

Dependent Variables: Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Conflict; inter-institutional cooperation & conflict; decision-making; innovation; communication; leadership.

GRADUATE FIELD OF EDUCATION
CORNELL UNIVERSITY
Ithaca, New York 14850

APPENDIX B

Dear Dr. ______________:

I am a Ph.D. candidate at Cornell University specializing in the study of higher education and the sociology of formal organizations. My dissertation, "Behavior in Consortia: Toward a Theory of Inter-Organizational Behavior," is an exploratory study of relationships between institutions of higher education and is aimed at developing hypotheses and administrative guidelines, and refining a model of behavior in an inter-organizational situation.

At present I am engaged in a field study of a multilateral consortium. In an attempt to sample a variety of consortia with different characteristics, I now wish to study a bilateral arrangement dealing with many facets of the involved institutions. According to a typology of consortia in higher education published by the U.S. Office of Education, such an arrangement exists between ________________________ University and ______________________ College.

It is my hope that you will grant me permission to conduct a field study of this consortium. This would allow me to review the literature pertaining to the arrangement and to interview the staff and faculty who are involved. I expect that I would spend two to three weeks on each campus beginning in ____________. Needless to say, the confidentiality of the data and the anonymity of the institutions would be scrupulously maintained.

With respect to my credentials, I hold an A.B. from Rutgers University and an M.A. from Columbia University. At Cornell I am on a National Defense Education Act Title IV Fellowship, and I completed my comprehensive examinations last winter. My proposal has been accepted by my committee, which includes Professor Joan Egner and Professor William Foote Whyte; and it has been fully funded. Next year I expect to teach and conduct research based upon the hypotheses that I develop from the data collected this year.

I would be happy to meet with you at your convenience to discuss the project in more detail if you so desire. A duplicate of this letter is being sent to President _____________ of _____________ University.

I look forward to hearing from you.

APPENDIX C

METHODS OF TESTING HYPOTHESES

"If deriving hypotheses requires the implicit comparison of several cases, testing them requires the explicit and systematic comparison of many independent cases."[1] And so, the investigator plans as his next step the testing of the hypotheses suggested in Chapter VIII by utilizing the large number of "independent cases" for his population.

The author had planned originally to use a survey for the subsequent portion of the research, but the field work experience has convinced him that a structured or focused interview, with the interviewer present, combined with a data sheet, would increase the validity of the information. Active involvement in the field is more costly than "waiting for the mailman," but the information gathered, especially when sensitive, is potentially richer.

It was indicated earlier that inter-organizational frameworks do not raise the same spector of loyalty as do the organizations to which representatives have initial commitment. Yet, some interviewees do twist reality, some find it difficult to assume other than a public relations attitude, and people are unaware of latent patterns of behavior. Thus, the presence of an interviewer as a probe is necessary.

For example, the researcher spent a number of days with the

---

[1] Peter Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach, Chandler Press, San Francisco, 1964, p. 11.

Director of the University Center. During the first few hours of the interaction, the Director indicated that he was committed to his enterprise and, in fact, had just attended a professional meeting. He "sounded" less than enthusiastic, but the author felt this could be because of his speech patterns rather than his emotions. It was only because of the events of the following day and one half that the author felt he understood the nature of the Director's commitment: his lack of action on Board requests that appeared in the minutes; remarks that the organization would last another five years, no matter what, and his knowledge of another organization that would welcome him; lack of books on his new profession; his obvious nouveau riche attitude toward his expensive possessions; and intimacies from a representative that the Director accepted his position more from pressures to leave his former employment than as a result of a positive feeling toward the new job.

The author never would have learned about this man's relationship to his work through a questionnaire to the incumbent or to colleagues in member organizations: most gave glowing accounts of the Director because their role expectations matched his behavior.

Questionnaire data is useful, but a perceptive and sensitive researcher should mediate between the instrument and the respondent so that statistical analysis is based on "good" data.

The following are operationalizations of important variables contributing to inter-organizational dynamics, questions that can be asked respondents, and methods of obtaining the needed information. The list, which is not inclusive, contains many non-obtrusive measures.

OPERATIONALIZATIONS AND QUESTIONS

a. Organizational prestige. A perceptual, subjective assessment of the relative ranking of colleges in a consortium. The environmental context is important.

b. Organizational strength. An objective measure of the colleges. An index could be derived from the number of books in the library, percentage of doctorates, faculty-student ratio, the faculty publishing record and attendance at professional association meetings, and students' test scores.

c. College environment. Instruments are available to assess the college environment. The Institutional Functioning Inventory being developed by the Educational Testing Service might be appropriate.

d. Homogeneity (for problem-solving by staff). The author would have to learn, with the aid of consultants, the functionally strategic factors important for coordination in different administrative areas. From these consultants, one could also learn about the changes occurring in the professional fields and the strengths of the local professional associations.

e. Central/peripheral orientation. The index could include the number of standing committees on the governing board, the involvement of different echelons of organizational personnel on the governing board, the number of meetings of different committees and attendance, and the costs of involvement (financial and travel).

f. Internal/external orientation. Determine from the respondent why he entered or participates in the inter-organizational relationship. This would also tell the interviewer the official and operational goals and their clarity. At the same time, the interviewer could assess the achieved and expected benefits to the other members of the consortium, the subject institution, the individual's area, and personal rewards and costs. One could also learn how significant the problems or great the needs.

g. Environmental factors. The physical factors can be determined through the use of a topographic map; logical regionalism can be determined through college catalog material, e.g., sports calendar, location of study centers, or by asking the representatives or their wives where they shop, which newspapers they subscribe to, and which local television news they view.

h. Strength and growth areas. They can be assessed through direct questioning about institutional strength areas and a longitudinal study of catalogs to learn about developing programs.

i. Thrust and idealism of director. The director, and those familiar with the incumbent, could complete a scaled instrument containing descriptions of leadership/administrative behavior.

j. Personal data sheet. This could include the following information: date of birth, educational and professional employment background, professional activities (research, meetings), responsibilities of present position including committee assignments, community activities, and a chronological history of consortium involvement.

k. The following type questions would be used with interviewees:

1) What are your expectations of the central staff (co-ordinator) and have they been met?

2) Use of the following method could give the interviewer a means of determining the issues, with their ramifications, and also be a means of gaining clues to the group dynamics of committee meetings.[2]

Do you agree with X? $(A \rightarrow X)$

How do you think the other will answer? $(A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow X))$

How will he think you have answered? $A \rightarrow (B \rightarrow (A \rightarrow X))$

This promises to be a useful method for exploratory as well as for more controlled purposes.

3) Describe the administrative process in project development.

4) Who calls the committee meetings, where, how often, how is agenda prepared?

5) Discuss internal and inter-organizational conflict resulting from interaction and its resolution.

6) Discuss the nature and adequacy of communication between the central staff and the institution, among the schools, and internally with regard to consortium participation.

7) Discuss peer relations in your college and how it affects your action in the inter-organizational setting. Whose opinions do you consider to be the most important with regard to your organizational role?

The hypotheses in Chapter VIII could begin to be tested through the suggested operationalizations and answers to the questions enumerated above.

---

[2] Thomas Scheff, "A Theory of Social Coordination Applicable to Mixed-Motive Games," Sociometry, 30:224.

BIBLIOGRAPHY[1]

Adkins, E. Robert and Dan J. Sillers. Northern Plains Consortium for Education: A Prospectus. Dakota Association of Colleges for Research and Development, April 1968.

Aldrich, Daniel G., Jr. "Maintaining Institutional Identity and Autonomy in Coordinated Systems," in W. John Minter, ed., Campus and Capitol: Higher Education and the State. Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Boulder, 1966, pp. 17-24.

Alger, Chadwick F. "The External Bureaucracy in United States Foreign Affairs," Administrative Science Quarterly, 7:50-78, June 1962.

Anderson, Wayne W. Cooperation Within American Higher Education. Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1964.

Andreas, Carol. "'To Receive from Kings...' An Examination of Government-to-Government Aid and its Unintended Consequences," Journal of Social Issues. 25:167-180, January 1969.

Associated Colleges of the Midwest. Faculty Handbook September 1968. Chicago (mimeo), 1968.

Axt, Richard G. "The Accrediting Agencies and the Regional Educational Compacts," Journal of Higher Education. 31:306-312, June 1960.

Babbidge, Homer D. "Design and Change in American Higher Education," in Owen Knorr, ed., Long-Range Planning in Higher Education. Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Boulder, 1965, pp. 1-6.

Bailey, Stephen K. and Edith K. Mosher. ESEA: The Office of Education Administers a Law. Syracuse University Press, Syracuse, 1968.

Bailyn, Bernard. The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1967.

Bakke, E. Wight. "Concept of the Social Organization," in Mason Haire, ed., Modern Organizational Theory. John Wiley, New York, 1959, pp. 16-75.

---

[1] This Bibliography includes sources related to all types of inter-institutional arrangements in higher education.

Barber, Bernard. "Participation and Mass Apathy in Associations," in A. W. Gouldner, ed., *Studies in Leadership: Leadership and Democratic Action*. Harper and Bros., New York, 1950, pp. 477-504.

Bar-Yosef, R. and E. O. Schield. "Pressures and Defenses in Bureaucratic Roles," *American Journal of Sociology*. 71:665-673, May 1966.

Bass, Bernard. *Leadership, Psychology, and Organizational Behavior*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1960.

Bates, Frederick L. "Position, Role, and Status: A Reformulation of Concepts," *Social Forces*. 34:313-321, May 1956.

Baumgartel, Howard. "Leadership Style as a Variable in Research Administration," *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2:344-360, December 1957.

Ben-David, Joseph and Awraham Zloczower. "Universities and Academic Systems in Modern Societies," *European Journal of Sociology*. 3:45-84, 1962.

Berdahl, Robert O. "Comments on Coordination," *AGB Reports*. Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 10:19-23, September 1967.

Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton. "Comprehension of Own and Outgroup Positions Under Intergroup Competition," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 5:304-310, September 1961.

Blake, Robert R. and Jane S. Mouton. "The Intergroup Dynamics of Win-Lose Conflict and Problem-Solving in Union-Management Relations," in M. Sherif, ed., *Intergroup Relations and Leadership: Approaches and Research in Industrial, Ethnic, Cultural and Political Areas*. John Wiley, New York, 1962, pp. 94-140.

Blau, Peter M. *Bureaucracy in Modern Society.* Random House, New York, 1956.

Blau, Peter M. *The Dynamics of Bureaucracy*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1955.

Blau, Peter M. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. John Wiley, New York, 1964.

Boulding, Kenneth. "National Images and International Systems," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 3:120-131, June 1959.

Boulding, Kenneth. *The Organizational Revolution: A Study in the Ethics of Economic Organization*. Harper and Sons, New York, 1953.

Boulding, Kenneth. "Organization and Conflict," The Journal of Conflict Resolution. 1:122-134, June 1957.

Boyer, Ernest L. "Interinstitutional Cooperation and the Exchange of Instructional Materials," in Current Issues in Higher Education, 1967. American Association for Higher Education, Washington, 1967, pp. 281-285.

Braybrooke, David and Charles E. Lindblom. A Strategy of Decision: Policy Evaluation as a Social Process. The Free Press, New York, 1963.

Browne, Arthur D. "The Institution and the System: Autonomy and Coordination," in Owen Knorr, ed., Long-Range Planning in Higher Education. Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, Boulder, 1965, pp. 39-51.

Brumbaugh, A. J. "The Proper Relationships Between State Governments and State-Supported Higher Institutions," The Educational Record. 42:173-178, July 1961.

Bunnell, Kelvin P. and Eldon L. Johnson. "Interinstitutional Cooperation," in S. Baskin, ed., Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965, pp. 246-272.

Burn, North, Sumner Haywood and Herbert Wood. Informal Discussion of Interinstitutional Relations. New York State Education Department (Admin. Services) Conference, Syracuse, New York, Randolph House, November 7, 8, 1968.

Caldwell, John T. "Higher Education and the States," Higher Education and the Society it Serves. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1957, pp. 75-81.

Caplow, Theodore. "The Criteria of Organizational Success," Social Forces. 32:1-9, October 1953.

Carpenter, C. R. and L. P. Greenhill. "Providing the Conditions for Learning: The 'New Media'," in S. Baskin, ed., Higher Education: Some Newer Developments. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965, pp. 128-151.

Chambers, M. M. Chance and Choice in Higher Education. The Interstate Press, Danville, Illinois, 1962.

Chambers, M. M. Voluntary Statewide Coordination in Public Higher Education. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1961.

Clark, Burton R. "Inter-Organizational Patterns in Education," Administrative Science Quarterly. 10:224-237, September 1965.

Clark, Burton R. "Organizational Adaptation and Precarious Values," American Sociological Review. 21:327-336, June 1956.

Clark, Peter B. and James Q. Wilson. "Incentive Systems: A Theory of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly. 6:129-166, September 1961.

Colvard, Robert. "Foundations and Professions: The Organizational Defense of Autonomy," Administrative Science Quarterly. 6:166-184, September 1961.

Committee on Institutional Cooperation. Annual Report, 1966-67. Purdue University.

"The Compact for Education - Views from Higher Education," The Educational Record. 47:79-121, Winter 1966.

Conant, James B. Shaping Educational Policy. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964.

"The Conference on the Cluster College Concept," The Journal of Higher Education. 38:357-400, October 1967.

Coons, Arthur G. Crisis in California Higher Education: Experience Under the Master Plan and Problems of Coordination, 1959 to 1968. The Ward Ritchie Press, Los Angeles, 1968.

"Cooperation Among Institutions: Achievements and Expectations," (Proceedings of 54th Annual Meeting, Association of American Colleges.) Liberal Education. March 1968.

Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960.

Corson, John J. "The University - A Contrast in Administrative Process," Public Administration Review. 20:2-9, Winter 1960.

Coser, Lewis. Continuities in the Study of Social Conflict. The Free Press, New York, 1967.

Coser, Lewis. The Functions of Social Conflict. The Free Press, New York, 1956. (1965 paper edition)

Coser, Rose L. "Insulation from Observability and Types of Social Conformity," American Sociological Review. 26:28-39, February 1961.

Crozier, Michel. The Bureaucratic Phenomenon. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964. (1967 paper edition)

Davis, Frampton. "Developing Colleges Through Interinstitutional Cooperation," The Educational Record. 48:348-354, Fall 1967.

Dearborn, Dewitt C. and H. A. Simon. "Selective Perception: A Note on the Departmental Identifications of Executives," Sociometry. 21:140-144, June 1958.

DeZonia, Robert H. "Coordination Among Higher Education in Wisconsin," The Educational Record. 44:288-293, July 1963.

Deutsch, Morton. "Conflicts: Productive and Destructive," Journal of Social Issues. 25:7-41, January 1969.

Deutsch, Morton. "The Effects of Cooperation and Competition Upon Group Process," in Cartwright and Zander, eds., Group Dynamics: Research and Theory. Second edition, Row, Peterson and Co., Evanston, Ill., 1962, pp. 414-448.

Deutsch, Morton. "The Effect of Motivational Orientation Upon Trust and Suspicion," Human Relations. 13:123-140, May 1960.

Donovan, George F., ed. College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation. (Proceedings of a Workshop at Catholic University of America, June 1964.) Catholic University of American Press, Washington, 1965.

Dorsey, John T. "A Communication Model for Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly. 2:307-324, December 1957.

Dressel, Paul L. and Lewis B. Mayhew. "Cooperation Among Colleges in Educational Planning and Research," The Educational Record. 34:121-131, April 1953.

Dror, Y. "Some Patterns of Inter-Organizational Relations," Revue Internationale Des Sciences Administratives. 30:285-286, 1964.

Dubin, Robert. "Stability in Human Organizations," in Mason Haire, ed., Modern Organizational Theory. John Wiley, New York, 1959, pp. 218-253.

Dutton, John M. and Richard E. Walton. "Interdepartmental Conflict and Cooperation: Two Contrasting Studies," Human Organization. 25:207-220, Fall 1966.

The Efficiency of Freedom. Report of the Committee on Government and Higher Education. John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1959.

Eisenstadt, S. N. "Bureaucracy and Bureaucratization: A Trend Report and Bibliography," Current Sociology. 7:29-124, 1958.

Eisenstadt, S. N. "Bureaucracy, Bureaucratization, and Debureaucratization," Administrative Science Quarterly. 4:302-320, December 1959.

Enarson, Harold L. "Co-operation - The States are the Key," The Educational Record. 39:140-145, April 1958.

Ertell, Merton W. Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education: A Study of Experiences with Reference to New York State. University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Albany, 1957.

Ertell, Merton W. "Toward a Philosophy of Interinstitutional Cooperation," The Educational Record. 39:131-139, April 1958.

Etzioni, Amitai. The Active Society: A Theory of Societal and Political Processes. The Free Press, New York, 1968.

Etzioni, Amitai. "On Self-Encapsulating Conflicts," Journal of Conflict Resolution. 8:242-255, September 1964.

Evan, William M. "Organizational Lag," Human Organization. 25:51-53, Spring 1966.

Evan, William M. "The Organization-Set: Toward a Theory of Inter-Organizational Relations," in James D. Thompson, ed., Approaches to Organizational Design. University of Pittsburgh, 1955, pp. 173-191.

Evan, William M. and John A. MacDougal. "Interorganizational Conflict: A Labor-Management Bargaining Experiment," Journal of Conflict Resolution. 11:398-413, December 1967.

Exline, Ralph V. "Group Climate as a Factor in the Relevance and Accuracy of Social Perception," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 55:382-388, November 1957.

Fiedler, Fred E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967.

Fields, Ralph R. Interinstitutional Cooperation Among the Associated Colleges of the Mid-Hudson Area. A Report to the Council of Presidents of Potential Cooperative Activities and Suggestions for Organizing for Action. Xeroxed, June 1964.

Fitzroy, Herbert W. K. "The Richmond Area University Center: An Experiment in Cooperation," The Educational Record. 38:241-249, July 1957.

Franck, Thomas M. Why Federations Fail. New York University Press, New York, 1968.

Frank, Andrew G. "Goal Ambiguity and Conflicting Standards: An Approach to the Study of Organization," Human Organization. 17:8-13, Winter 1958-59.

Frederick, William L. "Higher Education and the States," in Higher Education and the Society it Serves. American Council of Education, 1957, pp. 68-75.

Friedman, Myles I. and M. Elizabeth Jacka. "The Negative Effect of Group Cohesiveness on Intergroup Negotiation," *Journal of Social Issues*. 25:181-194, January 1969.

Friedman, John. "A Conceptual Model for the Analysis of Planning Behavior," *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 12:223-252, September 1967.

Georgopoulos, Basil. "Normative Structure Variables and Organizational Behavior: A Comparative Study," *Human Relations*. 18:155-169, May 1965.

Getzels, J. W. and E. G. Guba. "Role, Role Conflict, and Effectiveness," *American Sociological Review*. 19:164-175, April 1954.

Glenny, Lyman A. *Autonomy of Public Colleges: The Challenge of Coordination*. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1959.

Glenny, Lyman A. *The Nebraska Study of Higher Education*. Lincoln, n.d. (approx. 1959).

Glenny, Lyman A. "Politics and Current Patterns in Coordinating Higher Education," in W. J. Minter, ed., *Campus and Capitol: Higher Education and the State*. WICHE, Boulder, 1966.

Glenny, Lyman A. "State-Wide Coordination of Higher Education: Plans Surveys and Progress to Date," *Current Issues in Higher Education*. Association for Higher Education, 1962, pp. 242-244.

Goldman, Ralph M. "A Theory of Conflict Processes and Organizational Offices," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 10:328-343, September 1966.

Golembiewski, Robert T. *Behavior and Organization: O&M and the Small Group*. Rand McNally and Co., Chicago, 1962.

Golembiewski, Robert T. "Toward the New Organizational Theories: Some Notes on 'Staff'," *Midwest Journal of Political Science*. 5:237-259, August 1961.

Goode, William J. "A Theory of Role Strain," *American Sociological Review*. 25:483-496, August 1960.

Goodenough, Ward Hunt. *Cooperation in Change: An Anthropological Approach to Community Development*. John Wiley, New York, Science Editions, 1963.

Gould, Samuel B. *Possibilities for Higher Education in the Mid-Hudson Region*. Address Delivered at Dinner Meeting, Pattern for Progress, Newburgh, New York, September 11, 1968.

Gould, Samuel B. "The University and State Government: Fears and Realities," in W. J. Minter, ed., Campus and Capitol: Higher Education and the State. WICHE, Boulder, 1966, pp. 3-15.

Gouldner, Alvin W. "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles - I & II," Administrative Science Quarterly. 2:281-306, December 1957; 2:444-480, March 1958.

Green, Ralph T. "The Need for Coordination and Control in Financing State Institutions," Proceedings of the 55th Annual Conference on Taxation. National Tax Association, Harrisburg, Pa., 1963, pp. 476-482.

Griffeths, Daniel E. "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations," in M. Miles, ed., Innovation in Education. Teachers College Bureau of Publications, New York, 1964, pp. 425-436.

Gross, Edward. "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach," American Sociological Review. 33:518-544, August 1968.

Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency Role. John Wiley, New York, 1958.

Gross, Neal. "Organizational Lag in American Universities," Harvard Educational Review. 33:58-73, Winter 1963.

Grossack, Martin M. "Some Effects of Cooperation and Competition Upon Small Group Behavior," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 49:341-348, July 1954.

Grusky, Oscar. "Career Mobility and Organizational Commitment," Administrative Science Quarterly. 10:488-503, March 1966.

Grusky, Oscar. "Role Conflict in Organization: A Study of Prison Camp Officials," Administrative Science Quarterly. 3:452-472, March 1959.

Guetzkow, Harold. "Relations Among Organizations," in Raymond V. Bowers, ed., Studies on Behavior in Organizations: A Research Symposium. University of Georgia Press, Athens, 1966, pp. 13-44.

Haas, Ernst B. Beyond the Nation-State: Functionalism and International Organization. Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 1964.

Hage, Jerald and Gerald Marwell. "Toward the Development of an Empirically Based Theory of Role Relationships," Sociometry. 31:200-212, June 1968.

Hassenger, Robert, ed. The Shape of Catholic Higher Education. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1967.

Haire, Mason. "Biological Models and Empirical Histories of the Growth of Organizations," in Mason Haire, ed., Modern Organizational Theory. John Wiley, New York, 1959, pp. 272-292.

Heimberger, Frederic. "The State Universities," in Robert S. Morison, ed., The Contemporary University: U.S.A. American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Beacon Press, Boston, 1966, pp. 51-76.

Hemphill, John K., et. al. Leadership Acts III: The Effects Upon Attempts to Lead of Task Motivation and the Expectency of Accomplishment of the Task. The Ohio State Research Foundation, Columbus, 1955.

Hemphill, John K. "Why People Attempt to Lead," in Luigi Petrullo and Bernard Bass, eds., Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. Holt, Rinehart, Winston, New York, 1961, pp. 201-215.

Henderson, Algo D. "The CCC of College Relations," The Educational Record. 43:48-56, January 1962.

Henderson, Algo D. "The Role of the Governing Board," AGB Reports. 10:1-31, October 1967.

Henderson, Algo D. "State Planning and Coordination of Public and Private Higher Education," The Educational Record. 47:503-509, Fall 1966.

Henry, David D. "Some Critical Issues in American Higher Education - The Public University," AGB Reports. 9:5-23, June 1967.

Henry, David D. What Priority for Education? The American Public Must Soon Decide. University of Illinois, Urbana, 1961.

Hermann, Charles F. "Some Consequences of Crisis Which Limit the Viability of Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly. 8:61-82, June 1963.

Hermann, Margaret G. and Nathan Kogan. "Negotiation in Leader and Delegate Groups," Journal of Conflict Resolution. 12:332-344, September 1968.

Higher Education Tomorrow - Challenges and Opportunities for the University of Minnesota. Report of the Proceedings of a Faculty Conference. University of Minnesota, mimeo, 1962.

Holy, T. C. "The Co-ordinating Council for Higher Education in California: A Review of its First Two Years," Journal of Higher Education. 35:313-321, June 1964.

Homans, George C. Social Behavior: Its Elementary Forms. Harcourt, Brace, and World, New York, 1961.

Howard, Lawrence C., ed. Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education. Proceedings of the Conference on Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, March 1967. Institute of Human Relations, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, 1967.

Huston, Clifford G. and Robert J. Forbes. "Western Personnel Institute: A Regional Development in Education," The Educational Record. 34:77-80, January 1953.

Iklé, Fred Charles. How Nations Negotiate. Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1967.

Jacobson, Eugene, W. W. Charters, and Seymour Lieberman. "The Use of the Role Concept in the Study of Complex Organizations," The Journal of Social Issues, 7:18-27, No. 7, 1951.

Janis, Irving L. "Decisional Conflicts: A Theoretical Analysis," The Journal of Conflict Resolution. 3:6-27, March 1959.

Janowitz, Morris and William Delany. "The Bureaucrat and the Public: A Study of Informational Perspectives," Administrative Science Quarterly. 2:141-162, September 1957.

Johnson, Eldon L. "Consortia in Higher Education," The Educational Record. 48:341-347, Fall 1967.

Johnson, Eldon L. "Cooperation in Higher Education," Liberal Education. 48:475-478, December 1962.

Jorgeman, Albert N. "What Should be the Relation Between the State Government and the Publically Supported Institutions of Higher Education?" Current Issues in Higher Education, 1960. Association for Higher Education, Washington, pp. 222-224.

Kahn, Robert L. et. al. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. John Wiley, New York, 1964.

Kahn, Robert L. and Elise Boulding, eds. Power and Conflict in Organizations. Basic Books, New York, 1964.

Kallen, Horace M. "Innovation," in Amitai and Eva Etzioni, eds. Social Change. Basic Books, New York, 1964.

Kammerer, Gladys M. "Role Diversity of City Managers," Administrative Science Quarterly. 8:421-442, March 1964.

Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education. Coordinator, III, 8, Summer 1967.

Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education. Purposes - Programs, 1964.

Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education. *Second Annual Report of the Executive Director, September 1, 1963 - August 31, 1964*.

Katz, Daniel. "Consistent Reactive Participation of Group Members and Reduction of Inter-Group Conflicts," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 3:28-40, March 1959.

Katz, Fred E. "The School as a Complex Social Organization: A Consideration of Patterns of Autonomy," *Harvard Educational Review*. 34:428-455, Summer 1964.

Kerr, Clark and A. Siegel. "The Inter-Industry Propensity to Strike - An International Comparison," in A. Kornhauser, et. al. eds., *Industrial Conflict*. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1954, pp. 189-212.

Kogan, Nathan and Michael A. Wallach. "Group Risk Taking as a Function of Members' Anxiety and Defensiveness," *Journal of Personality*. 35:50-63, March 1967.

Kuhlman, A. F. *The Development of University Centers in the South*. The Peabody and Vanderbilt University Presses, Nashville, 1942.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.

Landsberger, Henry. "The Horizontal Dimension in Bureaucracy," *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 6:299-332, December 1961.

Laulicht, Jerome. "The Pattern Variable Theory and Sociogram Analysis," *Social Forces*. 33:250-254, March 1955.

Lawrence, Paul R. and Jay W. Lorsch. "Differentiation and Integration in Complex Organizations," *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 12:1-47, June 1967.

Lawrence, Paul R. and Jay W. Lorsch. *Organization and Environment: Managing Differentiation and Integration*. Division of Research, Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, Boston, 1967.

Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Wagner Thielens, Jr. *The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crisis*. Free Press, Glencoe, 1958.

Leach, Richard H. and Redding S. Sugg, Jr. *The Administration of Interstate Compacts*. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1959.

The Legislature and Higher Education in New York State: A Report by the Legislature's Consultant on Higher Education. Academy for Educational Development, New York, 1964.

Levine, Sol and Paul E. White. "Exchange as a Conceptual Framework for the Study of Inter-organizational Relationships," Administrative Science Quarterly. 5:583-601, March 1961.

Lewin, Kurt. "Group Dynamics and Social Change," in Amitai and Eva Etzioni, eds., Social Change. Basic Books, New York, 1964.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961.

Lindblom, Charles E. The Intelligence of Democracy: Decision Making Through Mutual Adjustment. The Free Press, New York, 1965.

Litchfield, Edward H. "Organization in Large American Universities: The Faculties," Journal of Higher Education. 30:353-364, October 1959.

Litwak, Eugene and Lydia F. Hylton. "Inter-Organizational Analysis: A Hypothesis on Coordinating Agencies," Administrative Science Quarterly. 6:396-420, March 1962.

McCain, Paul M. "Library Coop in Arkansas," Liberal Education. 48:21-25, March 1962.

McCall, George J. and J. L. Simmons. Identities and Interactions. The Free Press, New York, 1966.

McConnell, T. R. A General Pattern for American Higher Education. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962.

McConnell, T. R. "Government and the University - A Comparative Analysis," in M. G. Ross, ed., Governments and the University. St. Martin's Press, New York, in association with York University, 1966, pp. 69-92.

McConnell, T. R. "The University and the State: A Comparative Study," in W. J. Minter, ed., Campus and Capitol: Higher Education and the State. WICHE, Boulder, 1966, pp. 89-118.

McGrath, Joseph E. "A Social Psychological Approach to the Study of Negotiation," in Raymond V. Bowers, ed., Studies on Behavior in Organizations: A Research Symposium. University of Georgia Press, Athens, 1966, pp. 101-134.

McKersie, Robert B. et. al. "Interorganizational Bargaining in Labor Negotiations," Journal of Conflict Resolution. 9:463-481, December 1965.

March, James and Herbert Simon. Organizations. John Wiley, New York, 1958.

Martorana, S. V., J. C. Messersmith, and L. O. Nelson. Cooperative Projects Among Colleges and Universities. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, OE50020, Government Printing Office, 1961.

Martorana, S. V. and Ernest V. Hollis. State Boards Responsible for Higher Education. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OE 53005, Circ619, GPO, 1960.

Martorana, S. V. "State-Wide Coordination of Higher Education: Plans, Surveys, and Progress to Date," Current Issues in Higher Education. Association for Higher Education, 1962, pp. 245-248.

Mauss, Marcel. The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies. W. W. Norton and Co., New York, 1967.

Mead, George H. Mind, Self and Society. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1934.

Mechanic, David. "Sources of Power of Lower Participants in Complex Organizations," Administrative Science Quarterly. 8:349-364, December 1962.

Mellinger, Glen D. "Interpersonal Trust as a Factor in Communication," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 52:304-309, May 1956.

Merton, Robert K. "Role of the Intellectual in a Public Bureaucracy," Social Forces. 23:405-415, May 1945.

Merton, Robert K. Social Theory and Social Structure. Second Edition. Free Press, Glencoe, 1957.

Messersmith, James C. "Ideas and Patterns for Future Programs of Interinstitutional Cooperation," Current Issues in Higher Education, 1962. Association for Higher Education, pp. 100-103.

Meyer, Samuel L. "The University of the Pacific and its 'Cluster Colleges'," in Hugh Stickler, ed., Experimental Colleges: Their Role in American Higher Education. Florida State University, Tallahassee, 1964, pp. 73-89.

Miller, Delbert C. and Fremont A. Shull, Jr. "The Prediction of Administrative Role Conflict Resolutions," Administrative Science Quarterly. 7:143-160, September 1962.

Miller, E. J. and A. K. Rice. Systems of Organization: The Control of Task and Sentient Boundaries. Tavistock Publications, London, 1967.

Miller, James L., Jr. "New Directions in the Coordination of Higher Education," AGB Reports. 9:3-12, November 1966.

Miller, Paul A. "Clearing the Way for Innovation," The Educational Record. 48:138-143, Spring 1967.

Millett, John D. "State Planning for Higher Education," The Educational Record. 46:223-230, Summer 1965.

Millett, John D. "State Planning for Higher Education," North Central Association Quarterly. 40:299-301, Winter 1966.

Mishler, Elliot G. "Personality Characteristics and the Resolution of Role Conflicts," Public Opinion Quarterly. 17:115-135, Spring 1953.

Mitchell, William C. "Occupational Role Strains: The American Elective Public Official," Administrative Science Quarterly. 3:210-224, September 1958.

Mohr, Lawrence B. "Determinants of Innovation in Organizations," The American Political Science Review. 63:111-126, March 1969.

Moore, Raymond S. Consortiums in Higher Education 1965-66: Report of an Exploratory Study. U.S. Office of Education, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1968.

Moore, Raymond S. A Guide to Higher Education Consortiums: 1965-66. OE-50051. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1967.

Moore, Raymond S. "Interinstitutional Cooperation," in Current Issues in Higher Education, 1967. American Association for Higher Education, Washington, 1967, pp. 272-276.

Moos, Malcolm and Francis E. Rourke. The Campus and the State. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1959.

Mott, Basil J. F. Anatomy of a Coordinating Council: Implications for Planning. University of Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh, 1968.

Mouton, Jane and Robert R. Blake. "The Influence of Competitively Vested Interests on Judgments," Journal of Conflict Resolution. 6:149-153, June 1962.

New York State and Private Higher Education: Report of the Select Committee on the Future of Private and Independent Higher Education in New York State. Bureau of Publications, The New York State Education Department, Albany, New York, 1968.

North, Robert C., Harold E. Koch, Jr., and Dina A. Zinnes. "The Integrative Functions of Conflict," The Journal of Conflict Resolution. 4:355-374, September 1960.

Paloli, Ernest G. "Organization Types and Role Strains: An Experimental Study of Complex Organizations," Sociology and Social Research. 51:171-184, January 1967.

Paltridge, James G. California's Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, Berkeley, California, 1966.

Paltridge, James G. Conflict and Coordination in Higher Education. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. The University of California, Berkeley, 1968.

Parsons, Talcott. Essays in Sociological Theory. Free Press, Glencoe, 1954.

Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Free Press, Glencoe, 1951.

Parsons, Talcott. Sociological Theory and Modern Society. Free Press, New York, 1967.

Parsons, Talcott. "Suggestions for a Sociological Approach to the Theory of Organizations - I," Administrative Science Quarterly. 1:63-85, June 1956.

Patterson, Franklin and Charles R. Longsworth. The Making of a College: Plans for a New Departure in Higher Education. The MIT Press, Cambridge, 1966.

Pennock, J. Roland. "Political Representation: An Overview," in J. Roland Pennock and John W. Chapman, eds., Representation. Yearbook of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy. Atherton Press, New York, 1968, pp. 3-27.

Perrow, Charles. "The Analysis of Goals in Complex Organizations," American Sociological Review. 26:854-866, December 1961.

Piedmont University Center of North Carolina. Report of Executive Director. Mimeo, 1964.

Piedmont University Center of North Carolina. Tentative Form and Content of By-Laws. Mimeo, ca., 1962-63.

Pondy, Louis R. "Organizational Conflict: Concepts and Models," Administrative Science Quarterly. 12:296-320, September 1967.

Porter, Lyman W. Organizational Patterns of Managerial Job Attitudes. American Foundation for Management Research, 1964.

Presthus, Robert. The Organizational Society: An Analysis and a Theory. Vintage, New York, 1962.

Presthus, Robert. "Toward a Theory of Organizational Behavior," Administrative Science Quarterly. 3:48-72, June 1958.

Price, James L. "The Impact of Governing Boards on Organizational Effectiveness and Morale," Administrative Science Quarterly. 8:361-378, December 1963.

Randolph, Lillian. "A Suggested Model of International Negotiation," Journal of Conflict Resolution. 10:344-353, September 1966.

Rapoport, Anatol. Fights, Games, and Debates. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1960.

Raven, Bertram and Jan Rietsema. "The Effects of Varied Clarity of Group Goal and Group Path Upon the Individual and His Relation to His Group," Human Relations. 10:29-45, 1957.

Read, William H. "Upward Communication in Industrial Hierarchies," Human Relations. 15:3-15, February 1962.

"Regional Cooperation in Higher Education," (a panel discussion) State Government. 32:250-254, Autumn 1959.

Reissman, Leonard. "A Study of Role Conceptions in Bureaucracy," Social Forces. 27:305-310, March 1949.

Report of the Conference with Developing and Cooperating Institutions of Higher Education. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Government Printing Office, Washington, 1968.

"Research Notes and Comments, Decision Making," Administrative Science Quarterly. 4:110, July 1959.

Ridgeway, Valentine F. "Administration of Manufacturer - Dealer Systems," Administrative Science Quarterly. 1:464-483, March 1957.

Riesman, David. Constraint and Variety in American Education. Doubleday Anchor, New York, 1958.

Robinson, James A. "Decision-Making in the House Rules Committee," Administrative Science Quarterly. 3:73-86, June 1958.

Rubington, Earl. "Organizational Strains and Key Roles," Administrative Science Quarterly. 9:350-369, March 1965.

Salerno, Sister M. Dolores. Patterns of Interinstitutional Co-operation in American Catholic Higher Education. Ph.D. Dissertation, The Catholic University of America, Washington, 1966.

Salwak, Stanley F. "Growth and Development of an Idea," The North Central Association Quarterly. 40:302-304, Winter 1966.

Salwak, Stanley F. "The Need for Cooperation and the CIC Response," The Educational Record. 45:308-316, Summer 1964.

Scheff, Thomas J. "A Theory of Social Coordination Applicable to Mixed-Motive Games," *Sociometry.* 30:215-234, September 1967.

Schelling, Thomas C. "Bargaining, Communication, and Limited War," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 1:19-36, March 1957.

Schelling, Thomas C. *The Strategy of Conflict*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1960.

Scott, Ellis L. *Leadership and Perceptions of Organization*. Research Monograph 82. Bureau of Business Research, The Ohio State University, Columbus, 1956.

Scott, W. Richard, *et. al*. "Organizational Evaluation and Authority," *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 12:93-117, June 1967.

Seldon, William K. "The Governance of the American University," *Teachers College Record*. 68:277-288, January 1967.

Selznick, Phillip. *T.V.A. and the Grass Roots: A Study in the Sociology of Formal Organization*. Harpers Torchbook, New York, 1966 edition (Orig. 1949).

Sherif, Musafer. *Group Conflict and Cooperation: Their Social Psychology*. Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., London, 1966.

Simon, Herbert. "The Executive as Decision-Maker," from *The New Science of Management Decisions*. Harper and Row, New York, 1960.

Simon, Herbert. "On the Concept of Organizational Goal," *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 9:1-22, June 1964.

Simon, Sheldon W. "The Asian States and the ILO: New Problems in International Consensus," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 10:21-40, March 1966.

Smylie, Robert. "Legislative Workshops - A Method of Improving Communication with Higher Education," *State Government*. 59:266-271, Autumn 1959.

Snoek, J. Diedrick. "Role Strain in Diversified Role Sets," *American Journal of Sociology*. 71:363-372, January 1966.

Southern Regional Education Board. *State Legislation Affecting Higher Education in the South, 1967*, 1st Report, March 1967.

Stendler, Celia, Dora Damriri, and A. C. Haines. "Studies in Cooperation and Competition: 1. The effects of Working for Group and Individual Rewards on the Social Climate of Children's Groups," *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*. 79:173-197, December 1951.

Stewart, W. Blair. "Establishing and Maintaining Cooperative Programs Between Institutions of Higher Education," Current Issues in Higher Education, 1961. Association for Higher Education, Washington, pp. 189-192.

Stewart, W. Blair. "Inter-Institutional Cooperation," The North Central Association Quarterly. 40:295-308, Winter 1966.

Stogdill, Ralph M. "Intra-group - Inter-group Theory and Research," in M. Sherif, ed., Intergroup Relations and Leadership: Approaches and Research in Industrial, Ethnic, Cultural, and Political Areas. John Wiley, New York, 1962, pp. 48-65.

Strauss, George. "Work-Flow Frictions, Interfunctional Rivalry, and Professionalism: A Case Study of Purchasing Agents," Human Organization. 23:137-149, Summer 1964.

Sugg, Redding S., Jr. and George H. Jones. The Southern Regional Education Board: Ten Years of Regional Cooperation in Higher Education. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, 1960.

Thibaut, John W. and Harold H. Kelley. The Social Psychology of Groups. John Wiley, New York, 1959.

Thompson, James D.and William J. McEwen. "Organizational Goals and Environment: Coal-Setting as an Interaction Process," American Sociological Review. 23:23-31, February 1958.

Thompson, James D. "Organizational Management of Conflict," Administrative Science Quarterly. 4:389-409, March 1960.

Thompson, James D. Organizations in Action: Social Science Bases of Administrative Theory. McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Thompson, Victor A. "Bureaucracy and Innovation," Administrative Science Quarterly. 10:1-20, June 1965.

Ticknor, Fred. Technical Cooperation. Frederick A. Praeger in cooperation with the United Nations, New York, 1966.

Utah Coordinating Council of Higher Education. Coordination of Utah Higher Education. Salt Lake City, 1963.

Vroom, Victor H. "The Effects of Attitudes on Perceptions of Organizational Goals," Human Relations. 13:229-240, August 1960.

Walter, Benjamin. "Internal Control Relations in Administrative Hierarchies," Administrative Science Quarterly. 11:179-206, September 1966.

Walton, Richard E. "A Theory of Conflict in Lateral Organizational Relationships," in J. R. Lawrence, ed., Operational Research and the Social Sciences. Tavistock Publications, London, 1966. Based on Proceedings of International Conference on Operational Research and the Social Sciences at Cambridge, September 1964, pp. 409-426.

Walton, Richard E. and Robert B. McKersie. A Behavorial Theory of Labor Negotiations: An Analysis of a Social Interaction System. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965.

Warren, Donald I. "Social Relations of Peers in a Formal Organization Setting," Administrative Science Quarterly. II:440-478, December 1966.

Warren, Roland L. "The Interorganizational Field as a Focus for Investigation," Administrative Science Quarterly. 12:396-419, December 1967.

Wayland, Sloan R. "Structural Features of American Education as Basic Factors in Innovation," in M. Miles, ed., Innovation in Education. Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1964, pp. 587-613.

Weinstein, Eugene A. and Paul Deutchberger. "Some Dimensions of Altercasting," Sociometry. 26:454-466, December 1963.

Weinstein, Eugene A. and Paul Deutchberger. "Tasks, Bargains, and Identities in Social Interaction," Social Forces. 42:451-456, May 1964.

Weinstein, Franklin B. "The Concept of Commitment in International Relations," The Journal of Conflict Resolution. 13:39-56, March 1969.

Wells, Herman B. "A Case Study of Interinstitutional Cooperation," The Educational Record. 48:355-362, Fall 1967.

West, Elmer D. "A Joint Graduate Consortium: An Adventure in Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education. 36:366-372, October 1965.

West, Elmer D. "Opportunities and Problems for Leadership Through Local and Regional Consortia," Current Issues in Higher Education, 1967. Pp. 277-280.

West Virginia Association of College and University Presidents. For the Future Well-Being....the Unified Project. (No other citations)

Western Interstate Council on Higher Education. This is WICHE. Boulder, 1965.

Whyte, William F. and Lawrence K. Williams. Toward an Integrated Theory of Development: Economic and Non-Economic Variables in Rural Development. New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, 1968.

Wilson, Logan, ed. Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education. American Council on Education, Washington, 1965.

Wilson, Logan. "Form and Function in American Higher Education," The Educational Record. 45:299-307, Summer 1964.

Witman, Shepherd L. Inter-institutional Cooperation and International Education. Education and World Affairs, Occasional Report No. 8, New York, 1969.

Wittich, John J. ed. Proceedings of the Conference on College and University Interinstitutional Cooperation. Princeton, New Jersey, April 1962. College Center of the Finger Lakes, Corning, New York, 1962.

Woodward, Joan. Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice. Oxford University Press, London, 1965.

Zaleznik, Abraham and David Moment. The Dynamics of Interpersonal Relations. John Wiley, New York, 1964.

Zajonc, Robert B. and Donald M. Wolfe. "Cognitive Consequences of a Person's Position in a Formal Organization," Human Relations. 19:139-150, May 1966.

Zimmermann, Frederick L. and Mitchell Wendell. The Interstate Compact Since 1925. The Council of State Governments. Chicago, 1951.